THE WORLD'S ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE

FIVE VOLUMES

HENRY COOK HATHAWAY, A.B.
Editor-in-Chief

VOLUME I—OUTLINE OF HISTORY
VOLUME II—OUTLINE OF SCIENCE
VOLUME III—OUTLINE OF PHILOSOPHY
VOLUME IV—OUTLINE OF LITERATURE
VOLUME V—OUTLINE OF BUSINESS

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK *and* LONDON

OUTLINE OF HISTORY

PART I

THE
WORLD'S ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE

VOLUME I

OUTLINE OF HISTORY

PART I

By ALBERT SHEPPARD

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF GENERAL HISTORY, SCHOOL OF COMMERCE, ACCOUNTS AND FINANCE, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

and JOHN SEYBOLD MORRIS

LECTURER ON GENERAL HISTORY, SCHOOL OF COMMERCE, ACCOUNTS AND FINANCE, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK *and* LONDON

COPYRIGHT, 1929, BY
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
[Printed in the United States of America]

Copyright Under the Articles of the Copyright Convention
of the Pan-American Republics and the United States

CONTENTS

OUTLINE OF HISTORY—PART I

	PAGE
I—The Dawn of History	9
II—Egypt and the Egyptians	31
III—Babylonian and Assyrian Civilization	50
IV—The Land and Peoples of Greece	72
V—Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic Empire	96
VI—India and China	116
VII—The Roman Empire	138
VIII—The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire	161
IX—The Early Middle Age, and Charlemagne	182
X—Feudalism and the Crusades	203
Bibliography	224

OUTLINE OF HISTORY

PART I

I

THE DAWN OF HISTORY

Lord Balfour has said that the story of the rise, greatness, and decay of a nation is like some vast epic which contains as subsidiary episodes the varied stories of the rise, greatness, and decay of creeds, of parties and statesmen. He continues: "The imagination is moved by the slow unrolling of this great picture of human mutability, as it is moved by the contrasting permanence of the abiding stars. The ceaseless conflict, the strange echoes of long-forgotten controversies, the confusion of purpose, the successes in which lay deep the seeds of future evils, the failures that ultimately divert the otherwise inevitable danger, the heroism which struggles to the last for a cause foredoomed to defeat, the wickedness which sides with right, and the wisdom which huzzas at the triumph of folly—fate, meanwhile, amidst this turmoil and perplexity, working silently towards the predestined end—all these form together a subject

the contemplation of which need surely never weary."

And when we move from the relatively narrow stream of a single nation's history, to contemplate the broad landscape over which peoples and nations have moved, our interest is raised to the point of fascination as we watch the splendid spectacle of human forces, with all their interplay and complexity, moving across the face of this "unintelligible world." It is the story of man's effort to hold dominion over the birds of the air, the fishes of the sea, and every living thing upon the earth, including himself and his fellow man. We see the rise and fall of peoples and nations, the gradual emergence of the weak into the strong, the barbarian into the civilized.

Drawing a moral from the scene, we note the solidarity of the human family; the fact that, beneath all such superficial differences as those of color, of stage of cultural development, of speech, of customs, and of race, we are all foundationally alike. We are impressed with the fact that individuals, nations, and races all fall short of the glory of the ideal; that always and everywhere aspirations soar to the empyrean, while achievements walk in the common dust. Compassed about with a great cloud of problems beyond their capacities to dissolve, these peoples sigh for the wisdom and strength of former days when there were giants in the land. We see them looking over their shoulders to the

fading light of the Golden Age, enjoying the subtle pleasures of an unrelieved pessismism; or we feel the warm enthusiasm of the optimist as he describes the streets and furniture of the New Jerusalem lying "o'er the hill beyond." So we find that the hopes and fears of all the yesterdays are of the same stuff as ours are made of; that the peoples living in ancient days in their lowly homes on the Nile, the Tiber, the Indus or the Yangtze, were touched by the same infirmities and were moved by the same enthusiasms as are the peoples of our own day who live on the Hudson, the Thames, the Seine or the Rhine.

By cultivating a "historic sympathy" it is easily possible for any man or woman, even one who is commonly bored by the facts of history, to enjoy and richly profit from the romantic story of the rise and development of World Civilization. The study should leave the reader with a richer spiritual endowment, a deeper sense of human solidarity, a broader view, a profounder respect for the matchless resources of the human mind, and possibly with a firmer determination to "carry on" within the sphere in which he finds himself.

Man has traveled a long road, rough and steep, along which enemies beset him, without and within. His difficulties and obstacles might long since have completely obliterated a less indomitable, adaptive, and persevering spirit. It is im-

possible for us to do anything more than sketch in broad outline the few thousand years of this story. It may be that the most heroic portion of it is lost forever as far as definite record is concerned, to be but partially restored by the exercise of our constructive imaginations upon what we know of early man. What we call civilization is an achievement of yesterday. The broad and solid foundations of it were laid by the labors and sacrifices of millions of forgotten worthies, who, unconscious of the larger issues of their lives, pursued the even tenor of their ways, wholly concerned with the task of matching their labors and their wits against a recalcitrant nature.

The scene of our story is laid in a world so small in contrast with the vast expanse of space as to make it appear almost ridiculously insignificant, were it not for the important fact that, as far as our knowledge serves us at the present time, this little world of ours is the only one where life has come to self-consciousness.

The question naturally arises in the minds of all thinking persons, How did this world come into existence? Each age answers the question by the light of its own knowledge, or accepts the answer given in its religious literature. Science and religion are at one in this, that neither the world nor anything within it emerges by its own begetting.

Let us look at some recent scientific theories

as to the genesis of the world, and of life within it.

One of the most famous and inspiring of all theories concerning the origin of our solar system, and so of the world in which we live, was put forth by Laplace (1796) with customary scientific caution. It has since become known as The Nebular Hypothesis. According to this theory our solar system was at one time a glowing, seething, gigantic mass of gaseous matter, revolving with a slow uniformity about its center. Out of this mass of slowly cooling matter there were thrown off whirling rings, one after the other, each becoming in due course a planet, and one of the least of these became our earth. The central mass still persists as the sun of our world.

In the light of recent astronomical observations, and of astrophysical discoveries, this theory no longer commends itself to many scientists, for it sets afoot more difficulties than can be overtaken—starts more problems than can be solved.

Men have long observed that meteorites, which are made of iron or of stone, passing from outer space through the atmosphere surrounding our earth, finally come to rest on the earth itself. Astronomers calculate that between ten and a hundred million of these meteorites, in their wild rush through space, are annually burned up to the thinnest of gases by the terrific friction due

to their passage through the earth's atmosphere Not all, however; some do manage to stand up under the strain and finally arrive more or less intact at the earth's surface. This kind of thing has been going on for millions of years, with the probability that, eons ago, there were billions more of these meteorites than to-day. Did these scattered fragments from other disrupted systems form the original basis of our world? The great difficulty in believing so comes from the fact that the earth would have required some original planetary nucleus, some dynamic and assimilative center, some cohesive heart which could appropriate to itself these discarded remnants of other systems. How can we account for this cohesive heart?

Of the numerous other theories current, the one that is perhaps most in favor at the present time is called the planetesimal theory. Space does not admit of an extended discussion of it here. Substantially the theory is somewhat as follows: During long eons of time a process of condensation in a great nebular mass went on, and as a consequence of the condensation the sun was formed. Stars venturing too close to other stars suffered disruption. In the course of their disruption, vast rays shot out from them, which ultimately went off on their own account, or were unceremoniously thrown out. These rays formed clots or spiral nebulæ. Not satisfied to stay on their own, these whirling nebulæ attracted to

themselves any stray masses they could gather in—and all together set about the long and difficult task of becoming planets. One of these clots of incandescent matter became the "earth knot" of our world, possibly a hundred million years ago. At that time its diameter was probably shorter than it is now, but, being young and ambitious, it drew to itself innumerable planetesimals, expanding greatly in the process, until its cooling apparatus contracted it again to its present diameter of seven thousand nine hundred and eighteen miles.

While the outer crust of the earth was cooling, the boiling mass in the interior threw up various kinds of matter which gradually settled according to their weight; the lighter materials naturally stayed on top, while the heavier went below. In due time—which means millions of years—the oceans, seas, lakes, and rivers appeared, with consequent changes in the atmosphere, all such conditions being the stage-setting for the appearance of the life principle.

In what manner did this marvelous thing we call Life make its appearance? Life, concerning which nature seems so prodigal, so careless, and so cynically indifferent! Fragile, yet strong enough to uproot mountains, to beat back destruction, to harness powers to its own service, and to persist through its unmatched tenacity; adaptive, pervasive, earth's greatest wonder, the miracle of miracles, the mystery of mysteries!

Life must have had a beginning, for, as we have seen, there were eons upon eons during which the earth was no fit theater for its presence. How, then, did it come, and what was the manner of its entry?

Entirely outside the realm of scientific hypotheses, but profoundly influencing the thought and life of millions, are the answers given to this question by the great literatures of various religions, most notably those sonorous verses in the first and second chapters of the Hebrew Bible. Here, however, we stand in the presence of religious faith, and the answer given is wholly outside the realm of scientific test and proof; necessarily so.

A number of scientists, such as Lord Kelvin, Professor Helmholtz, and others, hold it possible that life may have arrived on this earth in meteoritic dust particles, which, as we have already hinted, may be the wreckage of other worlds in this incomprehensible universe of ours. Because of the amazing tenacity of life, it might well have passed through the vicissitudes of its long trek through space; and it is so adaptive that it could accommodate itself to relatively new conditions on this earth. When we cut the Gordian knot of all the difficulties this hypothesis presents, we find another which resists a cut. We accept the hypothesis only to find that the problem of the origin of life itself, quite

apart from the manner of its entry upon this planet, still remains to baffle us.

Other hypotheses would make the scene of the origin of organic life, the earth itself. We have no satisfactory evidence that organic life exists in any other part of the universe or of the multiverse. Scientists of a certain group hazard the guess that the simplest form of living creatures might well have come from some combination of non-living matter activated by some sort of chemical ferment. Chemists are able to make a number of the compounds of carbon of which living matter consists. But who or what originally took the place of the chemist? We have no evidence at hand to-day of spontaneous generation—at least none of general scientific validity. In the infancy of our earth, however, conditions not now present may have provided an environment suitable for the origination of this earth-life. Yes; there may have been such conditions, but until they are scientifically proved to have been existent, it may be wiser for us to recognize the fact that we are still in the presence of an age-old mystery. We must be careful, however, to acknowledge that it would be presumptious on our part to say that the answer to the riddle must forever remain unknown; for, in the words of the great Galileo, "Who is willing to set limits to the human intellect?"

Geologists have generally agreed upon four great divisions of time in the history of the

earth. In the formative or Archeozoic Age, the solar system was established, the earth took form, and through its various stages of development continents and ocean basins were made. No form of life, either vegetable or animal, made its appearance until the close of this period, when there emerged the simplest of backboneless life. In the Paleozoic Age, with its six or more subdivisions, the seas were stirred with life, and the first fishes arrived. Land animals now make their appearance, and by its close we have insects and reptiles with giant ferns growing in favored areas. In the Mesozoic Period we have the rise of dinosaurs, flying reptiles, flowering plants—some of them resembling many that we have at present; higher species of insects, and the lower forms of mammals. In the Cenozoic Period we have the rise of the higher mammals, while in the latter part of this period man at last emerges, to begin his adventure—some time before the last great Ice Age.

How man, the reasoning, self-conscious being, was created, is still a subject of controversy, one side holding that it was done by a single divine act, the other that it was a slow process of evolution extending through hundreds of thousands of years. The leading scientists of our day hold to the theory of Charles Darwin's *Descent of Man,* that man was created by gradual evolution from lower animal forms. In any event we know that we begin finding traces of his intelli-

gent handiwork toward the end of the Glacial Epoch.

During the long Ice Age the geographical features of Europe and the Mediterranean were entirely unlike what they are now. Great Britain and Ireland formed a solid part of the Continent, with no seas to develop insularity. Scotland as well as Denmark and Sweden were being preserved by refrigeration, for they were securely buried under a vast sheet of solid ice. Sicily and Italy were one; and Africa, Asia and Europe were joined together, so that the animals and early man could pass to and fro without the hazards of a water voyage.

It is impossible to trace in detail the several stages in the cultural development of prehistoric man, even if the means for doing so were at our disposal. But anthropologists, following the geological divisions, have designated these stages of human progress in terms of the implements used, so we have the Old Stone Age, the Bronze Age, etc. It is natural to suppose that the first implements used as utilities about the house, or as instruments of warfare, were made out of materials easily converted to that end, such as wooden vessels, clubs, and spear-like staffs sharpened by rubbing to a keen edge. The ravages of time, however, have long since disposed of such implements, unless we should happen upon some hermetically sealed cache, which is hardly likely.

There is no general agreement among scien-

tists concerning the first preserved implements known as eoliths, or stones of the dawn period of man's history. These stones may have received their convenient forms entirely apart from human agency and solely by the action of nature. But, as Professor Lull points out, we may be morally certain that an age which used some such rude instruments was the Dawn Age of Man.

In the Paleolithic or Old Stone Age there is no such uncertainty. Here we find man clearly demonstrating the gulf-like difference between himself and all other forms of animal life by using his superior brain power in discovery and inventiveness; by fashioning rough instruments in stone; by killing animals greatly superior to himself in brute strength, eating their flesh, roasting it in fires which he could light at will, and then sharpening their bones for tools. His adaptability is seen in the fact that he is able to accommodate himself to the rigors of the Glacial Age, accustomed tho he had been to the genial conditions of a more or less tropical climate. This man of the Old Stone Age had a wonderful instinct for drawing. Using bones, horns, etc., he drew with few lines the figures of men and animals, evidently finding as much pleasure in the exercise as a talented child does to-day.

From the Paleolithic we pass to the Neolithic or Smooth Stone Age. Here we are in a period

much nearer to our own times than to the Cave Period—probably just a matter of ten thousand or so years ago. At this time the continent of Europe had the shape it has at the present time, as also had Italy, Spain, and Africa. Various Paleolithic animals, such as the woolly rhinoceros, the mammoth, the saber-toothed tiger, the cave bear, had either long since become extinct or had migrated to more favored climes. The flora of the earlier and colder times had given place to newer forms better adapted to the new climatic conditions.

In this Neolithic Period we have a physical environment congenial to progress; hence we are not surprized to discover the practise of such fundamental arts as pottery making, spinning, weaving, the making of household furniture and cooking utensils; all the operations pertaining to agriculture, to seed selection, to the cultivation of such crops as flax, barley, corn. The domestic animals we are acquainted with were already round about man's dwelling places or grazed in his fields. We are indebted more to the people of this age, whose blood still flows in our veins if but thinly, for laying soundly the foundation stones of our civilization than to the peoples of the earlier ages. They seem to have led a busy and active life, concerning themselves more with their crops, their flocks and herds, their homes and families, than with other matters. Dwelling in communities, they had to

work out some form of local government and must have cooperated in the building of such village homes as the Lake Dwellings, in the erection of the Dolmens, and of other stone monuments. In their rudely carved Menhirs, however, we see no such artistic ability as characterized the men of the Old Stone Age.

This Neolithic or Smooth Stone Age was relatively of short duration, tho its culture-spread was wide enough to include Europe, parts of Asia, North Africa, and Egypt. We are not certain, however, that we are dealing in all cases with the same race, for this would indicate a racial unity which scientists are not yet prepared to accept.

From the Neolithic we pass to the Age of Metals, of gold and copper, for probably these were the first metals which man learned to use. By this time man was far enough advanced to utilize past experience, to experiment with his materials, so that by combining copper and tin he created a new metal—bronze.

It may be well at this point to warn the reader that these divisions in the progress of human culture are not to be understood as being strictly chronological. They are convenient terms marking out stages in cultural development, through which most races at some time or other have passed. Neither must it be understood that when one stage is at an end the next immediately begins. We are quite sure, however, that some

progressive peoples saw in their day the various stages overlapping each other, where the general use of the various implements peculiar to each stage, according to our divisions, went on contemporaneously, even as we of to-day see still in use in a single nation many implements that are characteristic of earlier stages.

The Bronze Age in Europe is fixed by competent authorities somewhere between 2000 and 3000 B.C. It may have been earlier in some places, as it was later in others. We may note that in comparatively recent times the Peruvians and the Mexicans were still in the Bronze Age. And altho the North American Indian used copper, he seems never to have learned how to fuse metals.

We are fortunate in having an abundance of the implements, weapons, and utensils from the Bronze Age in Europe, such as swords, awls, knives, gouges, hammers, daggers, arrow-heads, hoes, war-axes, hatchets, etc. They were also users if not the inventors of that wonderful little utility upon which so much responsibility is oftentimes laid—the safety pin—adding to its utility value by gradually developing the brooch. There was also a general use of glass beads for decoration, tho the people of that age do not appear to have used glass vessels of any kind. In all their decoration work there is seen a wonderful skill, and a sincere appreciation of the beautiful.

Unlike the men of the Stone Age, who buried their dead, the men of the Bronze Age practised cremation, having what we call family plots or burrows. Excavations in Denmark have disclosed as many as seventy deposits of cremated bodies in a single mound; thus showing that the same mound must have been opened and reopened in successive years.

All these facts indicate a high degree of mental and spiritual development, and an inventive ability far beyond anything shown in the previous culture periods. Perhaps this Bronze-Age culture of Europe had its origin in the East, for distinctively Oriental designs and patterns seem to have been favored for their arms. But whether that be so or not, this age of the use of metals clearly reveals the great studies these men made in the forward movement of human progress.

In the last great prehistoric period—the Age of Iron—we enter the daybreak of history. Man has at last discovered in iron one of the indispensable necessities of life, almost as much so as the air we breathe and the food we eat. No other metal is as valuable as this, as abundant, as cheap, as protean in its uses. For many so-called indispensables we could find substitutes, but not for iron. Its intrinsic qualities are so amazingly adaptable that our modern civilization might well be characterized as one which has adapted itself to the many-sided genius of Iron.

Evidence of the first discovery and use of iron seems to have been found in North Africa. And the time appears to be the period following upon the Stone Age, for the people of that region seem not to have passed through any Bronze Age. This metal has been found in the Great Pyramids of Egypt; in that land it was often used for ornaments. The Greeks valued it so highly that they presented lumps of it as the chief prizes in athletic contests. Homer tells us that Greece entered her Iron Age about 1200 B.C. So that more than a thousand years before Cæsar entered upon his conquering expeditions in the northern countries iron was treasured and used as one of the choice gifts of the gods. The early ancients used it for almost all kinds of decorations, for personal adornment, for several uses in the arts of peace, household and agricultural, for warfare in helmets and horse-trappings, possibly as iron crosses for valor.

During these long culture periods men have been drawing closer to each other, living together, working together, fighting together, thus making necessary the development of rude forms of social order and government. It is the way of life that, by reason of some economic superiority, or by wisdom in council, or by prowess in warfare, men emerge as leaders and rulers. The older men—the heads of families—become the Village Council, maintaining order, formulating rules of conduct, rigorously enforcing punish-

ments upon the violators of customs and of laws. Their savage methods of punishment appear to our humanitarian eyes severe beyond deserts, but possibly they were necessary in such low orders of society; we ourselves used some fairly rough methods of dealing with criminals in the pioneer West and during the gold stampede to the Yukon.

What was the character of the thought-life of these prehistoric men? Let us not fall into the too common error of judging their barbaric rites, their strange and apparently cruel rituals, their childish beliefs, and their crude practises, by the standards of our own time. Looking on all these things in their proper relations, we are forced to the conclusion that prehistoric man, especially in the later periods, did not fundamentally differ in his thought-life from ourselves; that his desires and emotions were all stamped with the impress that is still upon our own; and that, beneath all the differences of form and practise, we are forced to claim his kinship. Men have sometimes gone to the extreme of denying that these men had personality, have talked and written of them as children and as idiots; to such ends will men go in order to bolster up a theory, or unconsciously to reveal their profound ignorance.

The fact is that these prehistoric men were reasonable beings, like ourselves; their minds sought to unravel the tangled skein of life, even

as yours and mine. Nature too often seemed to them an enemy "red in tooth and claw"; they saw about them the "destruction that wasteth at noonday," and sought in meekness to bow their necks beneath the yoke. Brooding on the mysteries about and within them, there gradually emerged out of the deeps of their spiritual life the sense of all-embracing powers in the universe; some kindly, sympathetic, graciously cooperative; others destructive, cunningly contriving to rob man of everything he valued, possessing the darkness and lurking in the shadows. Some of these Powers of Darkness dwelling in high places, man could propitiate by offerings of various kinds; others demanded a more searching sacrifice, so altars are everywhere erected. Let us not imagine, however, that the lives of these distant forefathers of ours were spent from the cradle to the grave in the atmosphere of the tragic. They must have felt a passionate joy in nature's genial moods; saw new worlds in their vivid dreams, and heard the songs of birds as messages of hope. Physical vitality in and of itself stirred an emotional response deep and pleasurable. They had their joys, their loves and pleasures; for, being human, they are of our common experience. These men, whose lineaments we so dimly see across the years, kept the light of progress burning; they strove to understand themselves, and to think straight; living in tents and huts and

caves, they looked for a city having foundations. We are their beneficiaries, reaping where they sowed and gathering what they reaped, and the harvest as yet is far from being completely garnered.

It is unfortunate that the people of this pre-civilization era all bear in the popular mind the stigmata of inferiority, of brutishness and of savagery. Some of this is no doubt due to the riotous imaginings of scientists and pseudo-scientists. A single bone in the hands of some of these scientific magicians is soon transformed into a complete human being, physically perfect, but esthetically horrible. If our ancestors bore any actual resemblance to some of these productions, then our mirrors reflect progress in beauty, which is gratifying. But nature, when left to herself, does not often produce such ugly specimens of her craftsmanship, and why she should have done so with earliest man is far from being apparent. In recent years we have had more than our normal supply of sweeping generalizations, which too often are the last resort of baffled or tired minds.

When we open the first page of authentic history we find man in possession of almost all the fundamental inventions. He has learned the art not only of using tools, but also of making them. He has learned to protect himself against the inclemencies of nature by clothes and rude shel-

ters. He has learned to cultivate the earth in preparation for his carefully selected grains: to store up water against the day of drouth, and food against the day of need both for himself and the animals he has domesticated. He has long since discovered the boon of fire, and knows how to reproduce it at will. By the invention of language he is able to exchange his thoughts with his fellows: and in writing he has found a medium for recording his business transactions, the history of his tribe and people, as well as his intellectual and emotional reactions to life and the world. In drawing, painting, and sculpture he has developed a very respectable ability in response to his instinctive desire to express his love of the beautiful. Living in society he has learned to establish forms of government suited to his needs: and living as a little mystery within greater mysteries he has learned to set his feet

> Upon the great world's altar stairs
> That slope through darkness up to God.

Such a picture as these earliest records present to us differs in no great essential from life lived to-day on great areas of the world's surface. How all these inventions and discoveries came about we naturally have no certain knowledge. But of this we may be sure, behind each invention and discovery there must lie a thrilling story of trial and error, of success and failure such as characterize the efforts to-day of

men who strive to wring from Nature secrets, the disclosure of which serve to make the rough places smooth, and happiness a common inheritance.

II

EGYPT AND THE EGYPTIANS

WHETHER civilization first emerged in Egypt or in Mesopotamia is a matter still in dispute, with the greater weight of opinion favoring Egypt. We need not concern ourselves with the dispute, as it is more convenient for our purpose to trace the history of a nation which has existed to the present day over the amazing period of fifty centuries. This is without parallel in the history of peoples, and so is of great importance in our study of civilization, providing as it does a wealth of material by means of which we are able to trace clearly the gradual development of a great nation from its prehistoric background to its fine flowering in a splendid culture.

Herodotus, with the characteristic aptitude of the Greeks, called Egypt "the gift of Nile." Without the periodic overflow of the Nile River, that thin ribbon of fertility we call Egypt would be as barren as the deserts that encase it like a jewel. Nature seems to have been prodigal in her gifts to this land, for it was complete within itself. It is still the most fertile of all lands, tropical in its richness, yet without the disadvantages of the tropics. The Nile is one of the three longest single rivers in the world, bearing in its beneficent flow the rich silt of the tropics

which it deposits as a fertilizing gift upon parched lands. Each year, with almost unbroken regularity, the river fertilizes the fields, so that grains, fruits, vegetables, grasses for sheep, goats, and cattle return for the seed and labor expended, thirty, sixty, and often as much as a hundredfold. Such a land, small in area tho it was, was capable of maintaining a large population. Yet it is not of the type that produces an enervated race, for the dweller must cultivate his fields and must conserve the water in irrigation ditches, all requiring diligent attention and consistent labor.

Looking at a map of Egypt and the lands surrounding it, one is impressed with its seclusion. To the west stretches a desert area, to cross which necessitates long days of weary traveling, issuing ultimately in sparsely populated villages. A narrower desert lies to the east, but the Red Sea lies beyond it, and beyond that comes the Nubian desert. To the south there stretches for hundreds of miles the barren land of Nubia. If one has come down the relatively short route from Palestine he must still travel several days across barren wastes. All these adjoining lands were inhabited by poor nomads who could ravage for a short time but could not conquer the tenacious Egyptians. This seclusiveness was highly conducive to the rise and development of civilization. In our own day we think of civilization in terms of intercourse—interchange of

ideas, travel, cosmopolitanism. But in primitive times what was needed for the development of civilization was security from warlike neighbors bent on despoiling the land with their periodic depredations. So Egypt, no larger than modern Belgium, with its compact population, its security, its fertility, its sparkling sunshine, its congenial climate, was peculiarly fitted to be the home of a thriving, prosperous people whose destiny it was to create a great social system expressing its genius in art, in mathematics, in astronomy, and in medicine.

The prehistoric period of Egyptian history still remains misty notwithstanding the patient researches of many workers in this field. We have evidence which seems to indicate that prehistoric man in Lower Egypt entered the rich Delta lands from Asia. Migratory Libyan peoples from North Africa may also have settled in the western area, and others from the land of Punt may have found a home in Upper Egypt. Anthropologists will probably enjoy a certain measure of success in their efforts to solve the problem of the origin of relatively recent peoples, but it is doubtful if any certainty can ever be reached concerning the origin of such ancient peoples as, say, the Egyptians and Chinese. However that may be, the various strains coming from whatever area were all in due course of time welded together to form one people, of

which the present Egyptian is a lineal descendant.

It was this people which, long before the first page of recorded history was inscribed, laid the foundations of the civilization that we now enjoy. Crude tho the early Egyptians were, going about with their green-painted, unclad bodies; their rulers wearing each a lion's tail at his girdle and bearing a common wooden staff as a scepter of office; they were the builders of a nation whose rule even then extended over wide dominions of towns and villages. Minor lords looked with reverence toward "the great-house" or "the great-estate"—as expressed in the word Pharaoh—paying their just tribute of corn and cattle. And as the children of Israel, during their wanderings through the wilderness, placed the tabernacle in the midst of their own tents, so these more ancient Egyptians built a hut for their god in the center of their own group of huts. Carving his image in wood, they carried it about at the head of the procession on festival days. Using the flints scattered over the desert, they shaped knives and weapons, laboriously but exquisitely; from the reeds and rushes of the marshlands they made cords and mats as well as small skiffs. From the clay of the soil they made tiles, and a variety of utensils for their daily need. In all their carvings, whether in wood or in ivory, there is a distinctive character that is peculiarly their own. Over

a long period of time they had been preparing the way for one of their greatest achievements —the recording of their ideas in writing by small pictures, which at first stood for concepts and later for sounds.

A great deal of our knowledge concerning the habits and mode of life of this ancient people is due to their firm belief in immortality. From their burial grounds on both banks of the Nile we have been able to recover from the graves rich stores of utensils and the incidental things of their common life which tell us the story of their faiths, their mode of living, their workmanship, their inventions and their discoveries. A marvelous climate has made it possible for us to hold in our hands their linen wrappings, to wonder at the exquisite workmanship of their gold and copper ornaments, to see the grains of barley telling us of years of laborious grading and selection, and beautiful examples of art in pottery making, not surpassed in any later period of Egyptian history—all placed in these graves to provide the necessities of the future life. All this tells the story of long ages during which agriculture was developed, cattle raising, government, irrigation works, arts, some science, writing, and the use of metals, testifying to a relatively high stage of civilization. We find man's cooperative activity extending his dominion over nature; and the spirit within him plainly testifying to the fact that human life is

more than meat and raiment, or the satisfaction of physical needs.

All the discoveries thus enumerated come from the Delta territory of Egypt, and from the standpoint of its civilization this may be called the prehistoric period. For a long time before the opening of the second great period, the country has been divided into two kingdoms, but union is consummated under King Menes (3345 B.C.). Now we see a tremendous forward movement in Egypt's affairs. She has grown powerful, self-conscious, glorying in her strength and in her powers. About this period a stamp is set upon the characteristic features of Egyptian genius, never fundamentally modified through the succeeding centuries. During these centuries those gigantic monuments of human labor and human genius, the great pyramids, are erected to defy the ravages of time down to our own day. They tell us all we need to know concerning the dominant passion of their lives. Only across in Sumeria do we find any other people reaching such confident heights of self-expression. Elsewhere the peoples of the world are still slumbering peacefully in their winter sleep.

A walk through the Egyptian section of any large museum impresses one with the huge dimensions of Egypt's pyramids, obelisks, temples, shrines, sphinxes. In contrast with the art of other nations Egypt seems to have been passionately in love with the colossal. The rea-

son for this is probably to be found in two facts of considerable significance. In the first place, it must not be forgotten that the Egyptian artist was a pioneer. There were no models for him to fall back upon; no suggestions of treatment, nothing to provoke by comparison his creative genius; he stood alone, because he was first in his field. And the second fact we must recall is that art, in common with all other expressions of the human spirit, must create out of the content of its own experience. The Egyptian was surrounded by nature's immensities. The transparently clear sky, by day and by night, stretched out above him as a vast void. In one direction lay the great sea, with its uncharted waters, and on all other sides, apparently, were interminable deserts with unexplored lands lying beyond. He was set amidst the immensities, and his spirit responded. Also, he looked within and without and saw all the mighty things created by the spirit of man—especially so when their strength waxed mightily after the union of the kingdoms under King Mene. The wonder is, not that he created colossal objects of his art, but how, under the circumstances, he could ever have resisted doing so. For a just estimate of it we must appreciate its relations with time and place, and recognize its great importance in the evolution of art.

The pyramids, which the classical writers numbered amongst the seven wonders of the

world, are marvelous structures even considered from the standpoint of the present. No other land has anything like them, so that they still remain peculiarly Egyptian. They stand as the embodiment of a particular epoch, and witness to the fact that the people of that age were highly civilized—even tho we know little else about them save the fact that they were the builders. When Cheops came to choose the site for his pyramid he selected a portion of the plateau overlooking "the city of the white wall" and also of the holy city of Heliopolis. The finished pyramid had a height of 476 feet and a base of 763 feet square. Time, however, has modified some of these dimensions, so that it now stands 450 and 730 respectively. Even at the time of the Arab conquest of Egypt in A.D. 639-40, the pyramid still retained its polished facing, colored by age, but all so beautifully joined together that one would imagine the entire structure to have been made out of a single slab of colored stone. Great tombs they were, for individuals or for families, and almost every device imaginable was incorporated within the structures in order to conceal from lawless eyes the exact position of the sarcophagus. Not only did the kings erect these impressive family tombs, but from the beginning of the IVth to the end of XIVth Dynasty—that is, during a period of about fifteen hundred years—the construction of pyramids went on as a common matter of

state affairs financed by government funds. Princes and princesses drew from their own resources to build theirs, so that these structures stretch along the roads to a distance of sixty miles or so.

During these centuries we find an expanding life pushing out eagerly to acquire the riches of other lands. Mastery of the waters of the Nile and of the Delta has given increased confidence, so that, with larger boats and outstretched sail the Egyptians explore the lands about the eastern Mediterranean, carrying with them the commerce of their own land in exchange for the products of other lands. Caravans move overland and into the territories we know as the Sudan, trading goods for gums with their rich fragrance, ebony, ivory and the decorative ostrich feathers. After one has accustomed oneself to read the significance of the scenes of Egyptian life coming from this period as painted on the walls of the chapels and tombs, one realizes that the life of the period was much like that of the busy activities of the present. It had its poverty and its wealth, its crudities and its amazing richness, its sorrows and its joys.

But all good things come to an end. The probability is that so much wealth and such a rapidly expanding life brought its own internal disorders, so that the Pharaohs of the pyramid-building period pass away to give place to another period, somewhere about 2500 B.C. This passing

age has been marvelously rich in all those productions of the human spirit which have to do with man's daily life, his habitations, his government, his religion, and the subtler moods of his creative mind. Truly could the Egyptians look back upon this entire era and say "There were giants in the land in those days." Mixed elements within their population had contributed a measure of virility, of energy which in turn stimulated their thinking and drove them out to gather tribute from distant lands for the enrichment of their own. And then, when a high state of culture had been reached, its very luxuries made them soft, its ease produced a lassitude which made it impossible for them to rise to new duties and sterner tasks. Some writers hold that the Egyptians had at this time become priest-ridden, hence their decline. One says: "The priesthood of Egypt perhaps embalmed the civilization of the Nile, but they surely killed it." Such a statement explains nothing, only pushes the problem a little farther back where causes adequate to explain the decline may be found.

Whatever the causes may have been for the passing of the pyramid age of Egyptian life, it was not entirely to be regretted as far as Egypt was concerned. Other times bring other modes of expression, and we shall see that the Feudal Age of Egyptian history brought its own fine contributions.

The use of the term feudal in discussing this period is very apt. It suggests to our minds kings, lords, common laboring peoples, serfs, slaves, a civilization with a highly compact life. Wealthy land barons dwelling in splendor upon their estates ruled like kings. This period is supposed to have lasted for several centuries and was widely extended and thoroughly established by 2000 B.C.

From the pyramid period we have been able to recover but few writings, and among these none on papyrus. The inscriptions on stone which come to us naturally do not reveal much history, for they deal more particularly with the worship of the gods, sacrifices, processions, hymns, etc. The style is stiff and pompous, with about as much information concerning the life and customs of the times as one in our day can gather from tomb-stone inscriptions, or laudatory epitaphs on monuments, concerning those to whose memory they are erected. In the other records of this feudal period, however, we are much more fortunate. The papyri, and particularly the *Book of the Dead,* have a high value if only for the glimpses they give of the moral and religious life of the times. Numbers of school-books coming to us testify to the age-old problem of stimulating the youth of the land to be virtuous, and to acquire knowledge in as large doses as possible, with the same somber earnestness as characterized the sermonizing school

books of our earlier days. From them, however, we fail to gain much knowledge as to the details of living, except as we read between the lines. But we do gain somewhat more when we come to the Romances of which the Egyptians were so fond. Many of these are fine stories of adventure, of wanderings in strange lands, of the wonders of that fascinating world lying beyond the hills, the deserts, and the seas.

When we examine the papyri dealing with business, however, the letters, the tax notices and receipts, the police records, etc., we come into intimate contact with the life of the people as they actually lived. The official account which the investigating police returned to their headquarters after investigating the robbery of the tombs of the kings at Memphis—about 1100 B.C.—might easily have been written by the New York police to their department heads—for they couldn't discover the robbers, and were unable to arrest them. Not only so, but these ancient Egyptian police had to confess that they were no match for the robbers, so the authorities had to remove the sacred bodies to a secret cave. Tomb-robbing in those days was almost as honorable a profession as the legal profession is in ours. A successful tomb-robber was sure of wealth—and of a high place in the esteem of his fraternity.

From all these papyri we are able to learn much about the ways of the people, notwith-

standing the fact that we are tantalized by our inability to know more. We see their social problems emerge to the surface; we hear the cry of the poor and the oppressed in the writings of social reformers who strive to make their lot more bearable and laws more equitable. We note the great strides forward which medical knowledge and practise had made. Astronomy was becoming more and more of a science, tho the Egyptians do not appear to have been alone in this. The Pharaohs of the period greatly extended the functions of government, and greatly improved it. As in the pyramid period the wealth of other lands is carried by sea in their ships, and over the land by their unresting caravans. A canal was dug from the Red Sea to a branch of the Nile—a Panama project which meant as much to Egypt's trade as the latter does to ours. Truly a rich and ample life, full of glorious achievements, of immense wealth, of benumbing poverty, of far-flung interests and of economic gains.

The last great period we shall consider is that of the Empire—about 1580-1150 B.C.

The close of the Feudal Period finds Egypt in a condition of political decadence and corruption, and the glory that was Egypt seems to have passed away, save in the memories of men and the monuments and tombs. The Hyksos, probably a powerful Bedouin tribe, conquer the enervated Egyptians and rule over them as

barbarian conquerors. But, it seems that these Hyksos could not maintain their place as conquerors, for their lax rule made it possible for the Egyptian princes, who ruled as vassals in the cities, to rise and win again their freedom. One of them in particular, who ruled the little city of Thebes in Upper Egypt with some of the genius of a Napoleon, gained first of all a supremacy over the other princes, and finally successfully matched his prowess with the Hyksos themselves. Egypt is now free once more and under the rule of its own princes. With Thebes as capital and Amen as god she goes on to a more glorious period, into probably the greatest age in her long history. Now the arm of Egypt is to extend itself northward to Northern Syria; southward to the Sudan; holding friendly intercourse with the rising Assyrians and the peoples of ancient Babylonia. These two ancient civilizations, Egypt and Babylonia, have been developing along similar lines. They had not much intimate contact with each other, but it is morally certain that for some few centuries the two civilizations which have meant so much to the world must have enjoyed interchange of possessions and ideas. Trade not only went on between these countries, but also with the Mycenean civilization, and the wealth pouring into the country made possible the erection of those gigantic Theban temples.

By means of the discoveries made through-

out Asia and Europe, greatly increasing in their content almost every day, we are able to judge of the wealth, the art and the fine workmanship of Egyptian craftsmen, in the small glasses, the silver and bronze, and the faience. All these examples of her talents profoundly influenced the craftsmen of those lands to which they were exported. Within the Egyptian houses we see such forms of household furniture as grace our own. And many an article in common use today finds its ancestral home in this Empire Period along the banks of the Nile. At this time Egypt occupied the first place in the world, and one can hardly imagine the far-stretching range of her permeating influence. But not alone in these material things did she affect the world; there must also have gone out from her the quickening influences of her intellectual riches—her religion, her poetry, her literature.

Unfortunately, there is another side to this glorious picture of an amazingly fertile people. The poet has said that:

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay,

and so it was with Egypt. The application of great wealth to the construction of these wonderful temples transformed the landscape—but the fatness of wealth made her kick against the old customs and simple habits. The lords and barons cast aside their simple garb, their old-

time costumes, and vied with each other in costly raiment proclaiming their importance. The language is stripped of its former elegance, and becomes a vulgar tongue. Coming into touch with other cultures, other habits and styles, the leaders soon take on the airs and habits of cosmopolites. The influences of Asia pour in; the sons of the vassals of Egypt attend the person of the king, like noble lords about a Louis XIV, and their daughters grace the grounds of the king's harem. Asiatic fashions come into vogue—things alien to the true spirit of an Egyptian. If Egypt exports her products she imports exotics from other climes.

Being broader-minded than their fathers, the children bend their knee to Baal, the Canaanitish god—to Astarte—and the gods of nameless tribes. Their ears are captivated by the singing girls of Asia accompanied by their lyres, and the harp of Egypt is silenced. Who knows how many Johns of Egypt lost their heads through the singing and the sighing of the maids of Asia? Egypt had not vigor enough to cast off the sleeping sickness of her own decadence. One wonders what she might have done in the days of her strength by the assimilation of new ideas, the absorption of the genius of other cultures! The father-in-law of the famous Tut-ankh-Amen—Amenhotep IV—did put forth strenuous efforts to stay the drift of the time by organizing a new religion, a monotheistic

religion, wherein the worship of only one god should be permitted—the Sun, which could be worshiped by all. How familiar it sounds to our ears when the hymns to this Sun-god reiterate the fact that men everywhere, of whatever clime or race, whether of Syria, Ethiopia, or Egypt, are all alike dear to him. God has made them to differ in color and in speech—he has placed them in different lands—but all are in his thoughts and to all his good-will extends.

But the earnest efforts of Amenhotep IV all came to naught because of family misfortunes, his own death, and the death of his sons-in-law, and more particularly because of the grapple-hold the priests of the old religion held upon the people and the general apathy of the people themselves. This was the end of Egypt's glory. It rises again occasionally in an autumnal display of splendor—but it soon passes. Egypt had allowed her spiritual resources to become too prodigally and unwisely expended; consequently in her political decay she could not stay the march of younger and more vigorous nations, who ascended to the political heights she had occupied, and took her place. The king's power had passed to the priests, and from their paralyzing grip it passed to the commanders of Syrian mercenaries. Then comes the Ethiopian barbarism—only to be displaced by Assyria. For a time, after the fall of the Assyrian Empire, it looked as if Egypt would regain her wealth and

power. It was just a passing light reflecting a forlorn hope. At the close of the sixth century B.C. she became a Persian province. Gathering together her wasted energies, she threw off for a few years the Persian hold, only to fall again into the same hands. From this date—400 B.C.—Egypt has never known an independent ruler of her own blood. She has been the prey of any despoiler strong enough to make his way to her. Alexander the Great took the country for himself, and on his death, one of his generals, Ptolemy, held it for his own. Down through his family it came into the mighty hand of Rome in 30 B.C. In the sixth century A.D., as we have noted, the Arabs conquered the land, imposing upon it the Mohammedan religion, tho a sect called the Copts maintained, as they do to this day, the Christian faith to which their ancestors had become converted.

Notwithstanding the fact that Egypt was dead, she contrived to exercise—as she does to-day—an extraordinary spell over the world. In the decadent period of the life of Rome the worship of Isis and Serapis spread far and wide. In that era, as in ours, tourists stood in wonder before the evidences of former greatness and felt the subtle influence of Egypt permeating their minds. This was a land of magic, of sorcery, of the esoteric—a veritable Holy Land of occult mysteries. And to-day, in the full light of the twentieth century, numbers of apparently in-

telligent people look on the geometric proportions of the pyramids as prophetic symbols which by interpretation spell out the meaning of the present and the significance of the future.

Egypt, however, speaks to our age, not in the language of magic or of the occult, but in that of her mighty achievements. It would be impossible for us to list the varied items of her legacy to us, for most of them have become essentials of our common life. The implements we use in our daily tasks, many of our arts and crafts, were to a much greater extent than we generally recognize, first used and practised and conserved in that civilization of the Nile Valley. How many of the ideas which are part of our everyday life have come to us over the long centuries from this people? No man knows, for not only are they our inheritance, they were also the inheritance of millions before us in the long march of civilization from their day to ours. But more than all these individual contributions is the fact that for some thousands of years, while the peoples in most other lands were still in darkness, this people worked its way out of darkness into light, and revealed for the first time the capacities of the human spirit, leaving as rich an endowment for those who should come after them as any people has ever done. For this we should reverence them, not in superstitious awe, but in profound appreciation of their inestimable gifts.

III

BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN CIVILIZATION

No two countries have more features in common than Egypt and Babylonia. The climate is similar—the fertility is alike in both—and both are gifts of great rivers. Looking at the map one may see the long ranges of the Armenian and Zagros Mountains and the head of the Persian Gulf. Lying within these boundaries is the civilization of the Babylonian peoples—Semitic in character and far-reaching in their influence, particularly through the Hebrews, on later civilizations. When we told the story of Egypt we proceeded from the Delta of the Nile up the river to the First Cataract. With Babylonia we reverse the geographical order; beginning at the head of the Persian Gulf, we follow along until we reach the shores of the Mediterranean at its eastern extremity along the Syrian coast.

The name Babylonia—possibly from babel, meaning confusion—was in ancient times applied to the lower part of the territory. The name Chaldea is also given to the region, because the early Babylonian Kingdom was called Chaldean. The Greek name, Mesopotamia (between the rivers), was first of all applied to the territory

lying above the city of Babylon and later to the entire country.

In prehistoric times the head of the Persian Gulf was considerably higher up in the country than it is now, and the two rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, entered the Gulf by separate mouths. But the accumulation of silt brought down by these rivers from their highland sources has gradually pushed the head of the Gulf lower down. This accumulated silt formed one of the most fertile areas in the world, to which wandering tribes were attracted, and within which they settled. It appears that up in the northern parts of the Syrian Desert, and in the upper regions of the Euphrates Valley, were a people of Semitic speech who gradually moved down to occupy the newly-formed delta, and who later on established the kingdom known as Akked. At the lower extremity of the delta, about the head of the Persian Gulf, there drifted in from the Arabian plateau other Semitic peoples, the ancestors of the modern Bedouins. In the regions round about the Zagros Mountains there lived a fair-haired people of Caucasian stock whose advance down the Tigris Valley was blocked; and these occupied the lands later known as Assyria. The Semitic people that had trekked into the lower parts of the delta seem not to have been anything like as highly civilized as the other Semites. But with the coming of the Sumerians into the same territory we come into contact

with a people of great intellectual and civilizing powers. We are told that they were a dark-haired people, speaking a language similar to the Turkish—in physical appearance resembling the Arabs, and of Indo-European stock. No knowledge has yet come to us concerning their original home. Scholars have found striking resemblances to the Sumerian race among the natives of Afghanistan, of Baluchistan, and of regions far up the Indus Valley, some 1,500 miles from Mesopotamia, where we first meet them. Evidences have recently come to light showing that remains of a very early civilization in the Indus Valley bear a striking likeness to that of Sumeria. What we are to deduce from these facts, we are not yet prepared to say.

The state of civilization found by the Sumerians when they entered the lower delta did not excite their admiration. After the fertile land had been settled and the swamps drained, we see towns rising, temples erected, government organized, and a system of city-states, similar to those of the Greeks and Romans. This system of decentralized government could not satisfactorily meet the requirements of a progressive people. It is not our puropse to enter into details, but we may note the progress and development of the country. By 2000 B.C. the Sumerian scribes looked upon their Golden Age as lying in the past, and took great delight in portraying

its glories; but as far as civilization was concerned, the chief glories were yet to come.

One of the greatest romances of Sumeria is the romance of its rediscovery. A few years ago its existence was a mere tradition, and most of the information we had concerning it came from the Hebrew Bible. And in the days when the Biblical "higher critic" walked on his dizzy heights, his vision dismissed the Sumerians as only a mirage. But what the heads of men could not discover was left to the spades of the archeologists—those modern Columbuses of ancient worlds. Now "the history of the Sumerians can be written and their art illustrated more fully than that of many ancient peoples." Nations that died more than four thousand years ago have come to life in these days of the twentieth century, telling us of their contributions to civilization and human progress. We may lightly touch on some of these contributions from Egypt—from Babylonia—from the Hebrews—and glance also at the great body of imponderable influences which entered into the civilization of these peoples; influences oftentimes more important than the mere implements of physical progress in material things.

The second part of our story has to do with the rise of Sargon I, the warrior of Akkad who made himself master of the entire region known as the Plain of Shinar. This man emerges as the first outstanding leader of the Semitic race. By

his tremendous capacity for hard work, his organizing ability and war-like prowess, he welded the separate elements of his Akkadian countrymen into a strong fighting force, conquered a large territory, built cities, changed the habits of his people, and made them over into a united nation. In his conquest of Sumeria he did not make the mistake of despising their civilization —he appropriated it. The assimilative ability of these Semites absorbed the genius of Sumeria in writing, adopted their calendar, weights, and measures, and took over their methods of doing business, as well as the arts of sculpture, seal-cutting, etc.

In later times we see the rise of Sumer to power over the weak descendants of Sargon. Ur, the ancient home of Abraham, and a thriving city in his day, led a revolt, joined by other cities, which in its successful issue led to the establishment of the united kingdoms of Sumer and Akkad. And in the ensuing peace we see for the first time literature flourishing, general prosperity prevailing, great buildings rising, and a more genial and wholesome humanizing of life going on.

Decay sets in, however. New tribes enter on the scene, among them the Amorites of Syria. These Semitic tribes settle about a small town called Babylon, situated on the banks of the Euphrates. From this center they engage in unresting warfare against the kings of Sumeria

and Akkad, and after a century of war by attrition, we note the rise of Hammurabi to power in 2100 B.C. He it was who finally conquered the territory, setting up his capital in the city of Babylon. This man has been called, tho not very appropriately, "the George Washington of his country." He was without question the greatest Semite of his line—the organizer of his country, the codifier of its laws, and a first-class administrator. Fortunately, we have a splendid collection of Hammurabi's letters at hand, from which we are enabled to gather a goodly store of valuable information concerning his times. We see him sitting in his office—"the executive office of his palace at Babylon, with his secretary at his side. In short, clear sentences the king begins dictating his brief letters, conveying his commands to the local governors of the old Sumerian cities which he now rules."

But by far the most interesting of all the records coming to us from Hammurabi is the code of laws bearing his name. This code is approximately a thousand years older than the code of Moses. It only goes to show how carefully dogmatists should dogmatize when we remember that the code of Moses was once thought to have come from a much later date than the reputed age of Moses, because such a highly developed stage of civilization as the laws presuppose could not possibly have existed in his time! The laws inscribed on this code of Hammu-

rabi were doubtless the laws appropriated by these early Babylonians from the Sumerians.

First, as to the discovery of this famous code. The monument on which it is inscribed is a cylinder of black diorite, an exceedingly hard stone, and stands eight feet high. It was discovered by a French excavating expedition of archeologists under the direction of M. de Morgan and was brought to light during their work at Shushan in December and January of 1901-1902. On one side of the cylinder is a bas-relief showing us Hammurabi receiving the laws from Shamash, the sun-god, god of righteousness and of justice. The king stands in a respectful attitude before the god, realizing the momentousness of the occasion. There are sixteen columns of writing in beautiful script, with 2,510 lines. These are some of the things Hammurabi says about himself:

> The just decrees which Hammurabi, the wise king, has established; for the land a sure law and a happy reign he has procured. Hammurabi, the protecting king, I am. From the black heads (the Sumerians) which Bel gave me, to be a shepherd over whom Marduk appointed me, I have not held aloof, have not rested; places of peace I have provided for them; I opened up a way through steep passes and sent them aid. With the powerful arms with which Zamama and Ishtar endowed me, with the clear glance that Ea granted me, with the bravery which Marduk gave me, the enemy above and below I have rooted out, the deeps I have conquered, established the

> prosperity of the country, the dwellers in houses have I made to live in safety; a cause for fear I have not suffered to exist. The great gods have chosen me. Hammurabi, the king of righteousness to whom Shamash gave the law, I am.

No items in the code are more important or more often stressed than those relating to personal responsibility. If a man stored anything for another, hired a horse, a boat, or anything else, he was responsible. Jerry builders would have had a hard time in those days, for the builder was responsible for the firm structure of the house. And medical men could not gaze upon an undertaker as a mere manufacturer of underground novelties, or as convenient disposers of their mistakes, for the medical men were held responsible for the lives of their patients. Another characteristic feature was the emphasis on reducing everything to writing—a marriage contract, a business transaction, each had the signature of witnesses and a seal attached. We are all familiar with the supposedly cruel Mosaic principle of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth"; nevertheless this was a great advance upon the unjust principle of trying to get a head for an eye—and a leg for a tooth. Hammurabi's code attempted to make punishment exactly balance the crime. and we are still experimenting with the idea. Hear Hammurabi further:

If a man has accused the witnesses in a lawsuit of malice and has not proved what he said: if the suit was one of life and death, that man shall be put to death. If he has sent coin and silver to the witness, he shall bear the penalty of the suit.

If anyone has broken a hole in a house, in front of that hole one shall kill him and bury him.

If anyone has committed a robbery and is caught, he shall be killed. If the robber is not caught, the man who has been robbed shall make claim before God to everything stolen from him, and the town and its governor within the territory and limits of which the robbery took place shall give back to him everything he has lost.

If anyone has caused a finger to be pointed at a votary, or the wife of a man, and has not proved his accusation, one shall bring him before the judge and brand his forehead.

In this period Babylon was the center not only of government but also of culture and civilization, given more to the arts and privileges of peace than to the privations of war. It offered an irresistible attraction to the Assyrians, whose conquest of this early Babylonian Empire made possible the rise of the Assyrian Empire (1300-606). The home of the Assyrians, another Semitic people, was on the highlands above the Tigris, towards the north. Some time about 3000 B.C. a tribe of the Semitic race had settled at Assur, where was the altar reared to the god Assur. Much of their civilization had been borrowed from the Sumerians—as was also the early form

of their city-state government. Enjoying a much more vigorous climate than those dwelling on the plains, they developed the fighting qualities characteristic of highland peoples. Their exposure to the invasions of other peoples, such as the Hittites, made it incumbent on them to organize their forces for self-preservation; and from this it was not far to employing them for conquering new territories. Assyrians had been dribbling down to the rich plains of Babylonia for a long time, partaking of its prosperity, and engaging in its commercial activities. The time was bound to come when the Assyrian kings would feel themselves capable of mastering by their armies the whole of Babylonia. After successfully beating the excellent fighting machine of the Hittites, they turned their attention westward, and during most of their reigns we see them occupying the countries from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea—and from Media to Egypt. Fierce and cruel fighters, they seem to have gloried in the mighty military forces they had organized, and in striking terror into the hearts of all who attempted to withstand them. We recall Byron's lines:

> The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold;
> His cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold.

As such the Hebrews looked on them. They had made their capital the city of Nineveh on the Tigris, from which Layard was able to gather

rich stores of knowledge after the city had lain in ruins for thousands of years.

It is probably not just to the Assyrians to say that their chief contribution to history is the record of their military prowess. For tho they appropriated the civilization of Babylonia, nevertheless, they contributed of their own stores. We know that under Assurbanipal—the last great Assyrian emperor—an effort was made to collect and arrange all the religious, scientific, and literary productions of the past. While the Assyrian used the cuneiform writing developed by the Babylonians from the cumbersome hieroglyphics, they enriched it by their own contribution in their developing literature. Tho they borrowed the mechanical as they did the scientific arts, they greatly improved upon them. The Babylonian system of imperial government was greatly inferior to that of Assyria. And in sculpture, as well as in ampler forms of architecture, they were greatly superior to the Babylonians.

The oppression of these Assyrian rulers, instead of breaking down all opposition within the many parts of their empire, only served to keep it under cover. Revolts broke out everywhere throughout the vast empire. The governor of Babylon made an alliance with the king of the Medes—Cyaxerxes—and Saracus, the last of the Assyrian rulers, had to bend his neck beneath the yoke. Nineveh—after a long siege—was taken

in 606 B.C. Rather than fall into the hands of his enemy, Saracus set fire to his palace, in which he perished with his family. As went Nineveh, so went the empire; it fell apart like a house of cards, and men tried to blot its very memory from their minds. What universal rejoicings filled the hearts of the oppressed peoples! The scourge of Asia had passed! Listen to the glad exultation of the prophet Nahum over the destruction of Nineveh:

> Woe to the city of blood! It is full of lies and rapine; the prey departeth not. The noise of the whip, and the noise of the rattling of the wheels, and of the prancing horses, the jumping chariots. The horseman lifteth up both the bright sword and the glittering spear: and there is a great multitude of slain, and a great multitude of carcases; and there is no end to the number of their corpses; they stumble upon their corpses. . . . And it shall come to pass that all they that look upon thee shall flee from thee, and say, Nineveh is laid waste, who will bemoan her? Whence shall I seek comforters for thee?

Upon the ruins of the old there rises the new Babylonian Empire (606-538), which, tho short-lived, is to make, by its great wealth and power, a deep and lasting impression upon the neighboring peoples. The Babylonians had never forgotten that before the coming of the destructive Assyrians, Babylon had been a glorious city—and their empire likewise. Under the rule of one king—and by his diligent and wisely applied

energy—Babylon was to be rebuilt, restored to its former greatness, and to surpass it, taking the place of fallen Nineveh as the new capital of a more glorious empire. Much of the stimulus and enthusiasm of this new period comes from the admixture of new blood in the old stream. This new blood comes from the Chaldeans, a people of uncertain origin, whose name is often given to this later period of Babylonian history. The probability is that their energy was the chief factor in the revival of power.

But the name most closely associated with this brilliant period is that of Nebuchadnezzar; he who walled the city about, and gave it possession of one of the seven wonders of the ancient world —the famous hanging gardens; the man who conquered the Phenicians, and led the Hebrews into their Babylonian captivity. In the book of the prophet Daniel we get a vivid picture of the supposed fall of Babylon during the great feast of Belshazzar—the historical accuracy of which is a matter of doubt. During a reign of more than forty years Nebuchadnezzar brought western Asia under his rule—defeated an Egyptian army led by Necho, occupied Syria, and forced the Jewish king to recognize him as overlord. Trade and commerce flourished during his reign—along the Euphrates, on the east coast of Arabia, and up into Armenia. Babylon became the greatest trading center of the ancient world, and its fame as a trading center was matched

only by its notorious immorality and its excessive luxury.

The Persians

The successors of Nebuchadnezzar had the forms of royalty, but totally lacked the power. When Cyrus the Great came down from the hills with his Persian army, he found no insuperable obstacles to his conquest of the land.

With the Persians we begin another part of the story of the Eastern world. With them we depart for the time from the Semitic to the Aryan peoples—tribes that had wandered down from the north and northeast some time after 3000 B.C., breaking away from other Aryan tribes and finding a home on the high tableland of Iran. Here they settled down, giving up their nomadic life. During these early years they were subject to the control of powers stronger than themselves. The Medes conquered them, and the Assyrians made their land one of its dependencies. It is not until the time of Cyrus the Great that Persia comes into her own—for the army is now thoroughly organized, and under his guidance it enjoys victory as its birthright. These Persians were a superior people: they had a rich Aryan heritage to draw on, and no great past to hinder them. We see this in the philosophical-religious system of Zoroastrianism, named after its founder, Zoroaster, who lived about 1000 B.C. Even to-day, some of the

descendants and adherents of this faith, driven to India by the persecuting Mohammedans, still live there under the name of Parsees. It is reported that a recent proclamation of the Persian government offers land in Persia to these Indian Parsees if they desire to return to their ancient homeland.

When the Assyrian was at the apex of his power, some time before 600 B.C., the Medes ruled Iran, and the Persians were vassals under them. When the Babylonians made a bargain with the Medes to join their forces against the Assyrians—which resulted in Nineveh being humbled to the dust—the conquerors divided western Asia among themselves—save the kingdom of Lydia. This little kingdom is famous, not solely because of the prosperity given to it by the fabulously wealthy Crœsus, but also on its own account. Crœsus had conquered the Greeks and had built for himself a splendid capital at Sardis in Asia Minor. When the Persians conquered Lydia, of course they took the Greeks in also, a most significant fact, and pregnant with momentous consequences.

Shortly after this event, Cyrus felt it incumbent upon himself to conquer the Medes, which he accomplished in good time. Babylonia was now aroused to the menace of this new power, but she had no great resistance to offer, so that Cyrus was to make a Persian empire out of his many conquests. He it was who made provision

for the Jews to return to their home-land singing: "When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion we were like men that dream. Then was our mouth filled with laughter and our tongues with singing." This was a distinct change from the minor key of their Babylonian hymn: "By the rivers of Babylon there we sat down and wept when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof. For they that carried us away required of us a song. . . . How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning. If I do not remember thee, may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy."

No man of the ancient world more deserves the title "Great" than Cyrus. Not only was he the founder of the first great world empire, anticipating Alexander's, but he founded it without staining his honor by wasting an unnecessary amount of human life. His shield "is stained by no horrible deeds of blood, of frightful revenge and cruelty" such as disgraced the victories of other conquerors. The records as they come down to us all testify to the fact of his generosity towards his enemies—his conciliatory policies—his rare statesmanship—and the kindliness of his despotic rule.

After his death the empire goes on for more than three hundred years. Disturbances arise

within the empire, and rebellions explode almost everywhere. With Darius (500 B.C.), however, Persia acquired another Cyrus. He energetically quelled the rebellions, marched into the Punjaub in India, and reduced it to a Persian province. In all the provinces established by Darius he was wise enough to permit—what many a modern ruler has never seemed to have the insight to do—the subject races to retain their languages, their customs, their religions, and their particular civic codes. So the temple in Jerusalem rises to completion, the Greeks in Asia keep their governments, Phenicia keeps her kings, and Egypt her hereditary monarchs. But perhaps the greatest achievement of Darius was his organization of the Persian government. Before his time the conquered provinces were guarded by garrisons of soldiers—they kept their own governments and paid their tribute. Many of the rebellions were due to this system, in that provincial governors, finding their strength returning, would decide to throw off their allegiance to the Persian government and give up the expensive habit of paying tribute. Darius appointed three officials for each province: one, the governor or satrap; the second, a general; and the third, a secretary. The governor looked after civil affairs, the general looked after military affairs, and the secretary looked after both of them. The governor paid the bills of the general, and the secretary immediately reported

to his master any collusion between the two, or the first signs of treachery. When the king issued the order, one or all of them could be put to death at once. Such a province went under the name of a satrapy. It was a great advance upon any system formerly tried for the government of a province, and it functioned splendidly for a long time after first-class rulers had passed out of Persia.

The successors of Darius were, in the main, a sorry lot. It seems to have been the fate of all builders of Eastern empires to fail to give their work any large degree of permanence. As conquerors they rode on the crest of the wave; most of their abilities seemed to rise to meet a crisis. But when the excitement and dangers of warfare gave place to the monotony of peace, these rulers seemed to lose every virtue. Now come murders, fratricides, parricides, daggers and poisons and gross immoralities, as well as petty palace intrigues emanating from the miasma of the harem.

The Hebrews

No other people of the ancient world ever exerted upon our civilization any influence comparable to that of the Hebrews. Insignificant as far as numbers were concerned: having no great art: no science: no individual form of architecture: no great philosophers: no political geniuses: they yet possessed one thing more

potent than all these—a literature within which is enshrined the highest ethical idealism the world knows anything about. Egypt, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, and Rome have all passed away, leaving us the deposits of their cultures. But it would hardly be an exaggeration to state that the world could more readily dispense with the total output of all these civilizations than with the contributions of the Hebrew people. We cannot look about us in these days on the practical forms in which idealism enshrines itself without realizing that in large measure this is due to the influence of the Hebrews.

If we doubt such a statement, let us take a look into those countries that were practically untouched by this idealism—India and China. Much of the age-long distress of India, as well as its present condition, is due to the fact that Hinduism and not Hebraism became the religion of the country. And the conservatism of the Chinese character needed the progressive dynamic of Hebraism in order to stir its spirit from a benumbing attachment to the past, to an appreciation of the value of the present and of the privileges of the future. As a recent Chinese writer has said, "The term 'materialistic civilization,' which has often been applied to stigmatize the modern civilization of the West, seems to me to be a more appropriate word for the characterizing of the backward civilization of the East." Its very materialism is nothing other

than crystalized idealism, and the main stream of that idealism comes to us from that mightily significant people who lived their day in the land of Palestine. We would refer the reader to the records of that people as found in the finest cross-section of a people's development the world owns—the Bible.

The Phenicians

We must mention another "little" people of this Semitic race whose influence upon the world has been more potent than that of Egypt or Babylonia—the Phenicians. Their state also was one of the smallest in antiquity—a narrow strip of the Syrian coast about two hundred miles from north to south and about thirty-five miles in width. Their two chief cities were Sidon, and a short distance away, the queen of Phenician cities, Tyre. But in time they were to spread their trade-colonies all over the Mediterranean, and up into other lands, ever on the search for new trade areas and commercial centers. They were the bees of the ancient world carrying the pollen of culture wherever they went. The necessities of trade and commerce drove them to perfect an alphabet, and from them the western world obtained it. In some respects they were unique in the ancient world, and this distinction was interred with them. For they were not interested in conquests, save commercial; they did not mind paying tribute to military powers, as

long as those powers did not interfere with their rights of trade. They had a Greek-like capacity for assimilating to themselves whatever Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Persia or any other phase of civilization offered; but their chief genius lay in invention, technical skill, business activity, and in industry. In the working of iron, gold, ivory, glass, and purple dyes they stood in the ancient world without a peer.

We recall from the Old Testament the story of David's wish to build a temple worthy of the worship of the God of Israel. It is intimated to him that the work had better be left to his son Solomon. So we see Solomon making a treaty with Hiram, king of Tyre. Hiram was to furnish cedar and cypress-wood, together with carpenters and stone-masons for the building, and to ship the materials on rafts to Judah. Much of the external splendor of Solomon's brilliant and showy rule should be credited to the technical skill of these master-craftsmen of Phenicia. Through their cities flowed the highly profitable trade of Arabia and the East: and their manufacturers were kept busy turning out their products of metals, glass, and purple. By sea and by land they traveled everywhere—missionaries of trade—the master-bargainers of the Old World. At the time of Homer the Phenicians were credited with being pirates—robbers—and merchants only by virtue of necessity. Possibly nothing worse than legend, but we are told they

brought their trinkets, beads, and cheap baubles, which they sold at high prices and kidnaped boys and girls to be sold in the Eastern markets as a side-line. Later on, when the Greeks had learned the same trades, they beat their Phenician teachers at their own specialties. Greece, however, for long years depended upon the Phenicians for certain costly articles, including the perfumes and spices imported from Arabia. So also from the famed shops of Tyre the Greeks bought their purple garments—their most costly wearing apparel—their jewels, ornaments, trinkets, far superior in workmanship to those produced in any other land or by any other people.

We are told that when these exploring Phenicians landed in Spain and discovered the silver mines there, they loaded their boats to the water's edge, made all kinds of utensils out of silver, even to their anchors, and sailed back with their rich find. They had no need to mine the metal, for it was lying almost on the surface, ready to be kicked up. When the surface silver was exhausted, they employed the natives —or rather drove slaves to the task—to open up mines. So did they add to their wealth, and continued their explorations and trading wherever wealth was to be gained. And in so doing they unconsciously carried with them the seeds of civilization, which in due time were to fall into good ground to bring forth, some thirty fold, some sixty—and with the Greeks—a hundred fold.

IV

THE LAND AND PEOPLES OF GREECE

HELLAS, the homeland of the ancient Greeks, was relatively a small country, bounded by narrow seas on two sides, with ill-defined limits to the north—the Greek Apennines. Exclusive of the islands, the entire territory was approximately 60,000 square miles. The Greeks, however, never thought of their land as having geographic limits; their Hellas was a Hellas of race and of culture and not of geography. Very early after they had trekked down into the Ægean territory, they disciplined their fear of the sea, so that we soon find them moving from island to island, occupying the mainland, seeking more fertile territories and engaging in trade wherever possible. They mastered the eastern part of the Mediterranean, dotting themselves about the coasts of the great sea, which seemed at one time as tho it were about to become a Greek lake; they established settlements, built cities, and spread abroad their culture to such an extent that Southern Italy became known as Greater Greece. These are the extraordinary people who have left such permanent impressions upon civilization as to make them easily the most interesting people of the ancient world.

Where was their original homeland before

they entered the Ægean territory? Neither their records nor subsequent researches give us any very definite knowledge. But there is no doubt that the various branches, into which the Greeks were separated, were all originally of one stock. When we turn to their records we discover that their myths and legends give us but slight assistance. Nevertheless, it is probable that there is some deposit of truth lying back of the myths and legends—tho it is impossible for us to recover much that is certain. The probability is that they came from Central Asia, while their earliest home might well have been northern Africa.

The early inhabitants of this favored land were the peacefully disposed Pelasgi. Their records tell of Oriental influences coming from Asia and Egypt, and bearing the cultures of these lands as fertilizing qualities for their own. If the existence of this Pelasgian race is to be accepted, it is more than likely that the early civilization of Greece known as Minoan, was chiefly of their production. Certainly, from all the records at our disposal, and by the discoveries of recent years, we are estopped from characterizing this early period as barbaric. Primitive it was, half agricultural, half nomad —ready under any greatly pressing necessity, whether social or economic, to migrate from one area to another; working the ox and the horse, and using the plow and the wagon; their wealth

consisted chiefly in swine, sheep and cattle. Fishermen were plying their trade in the Ægean; and their simple and patriarchal life spoke of peace and contentment. Each tribe had its own leader or king, who in council with the elders decided matters of importance. Their religious worship was without temples, being more or less of a primitive worship of the great forces of nature. As with the ancient Hebrews, so they had their sacrificial offerings to the gods—some of blood, and some of first-fruits of their fields and vines. Zeus, the bright god of the skies, with Dione—later Hera—the goddess of earth; Demeter, the earth mother, the Lady of Agriculture; Hestra, the god of the hearth and of the altar fires; Hermes, driver of clouds—guardian of the grazing herds—swift messenger of heaven; Poseidon, god of the waters, and Hades, god of the shades—the dark places of the underworld, these made up the hierarchy of their gods and goddesses.

We do not know how long it was that the Greeks lived amidst the primitive simplicities of this Pelasgian period. The probability is that the disturbing elements—the forces that began to ferment the genius of the Greeks—came from those masterful traders of the ancient world, the Phenicians. However that may be, in the next period—the Heroic Age—we come face to face with the four tribes into which Greece is divided—the Ionians, masters of the arts; great

in literature—in philosophy and science, with their famed city of Athens; the Dorians—conservative, militaristic, unimaginative, with their city of Sparta; and two others of less importance—the Acheans and the Æolians.

The peaceful and patriarchal times passed away to give place to internal dissension, stirring days filled with the clamors of destructive war. Fortresses were erected—the art of which the Phenicians taught them—to keep back the raiders by sea, and invading bands by land. Around the foot of the hill were the communities of the poor, nestling together like the villages in feudalistic times beneath the shadow of the manor-house or of the castle; while on or near the top of the hill was the "Acropolis"—the upper city where were the sanctuaries, the council chambers, the residence of the king, the homes of the nobles. Out of this period came the line of heroes and demigods from whom the later Greeks loved to claim descent while recounting the tales of mighty deeds accomplished by them. Chief among these hero tales are those describing the exploits of Heracles; the voyage of Theseus to Crete; the Argonautic expedition, with all its daring; as well as those thrilling stories of the Trojan War.

If the destruction of the city of Troy is placed somewhat before 1200 B.C., we find that a couple of generations later, political revolutions are taking place within Greece. The old is giving

place to the new, changing the aspect of Greece and also of her settlements along the coast of the Mediterranean. There seem, during this time, to have been waves of new peoples displacing the old ones. The weaker ones flee before the stronger—going out to establish new homes for themselves along the coasts of Asia Minor, and along the Black Sea. From the mountains come the warlike Thessalians, occupying the lands afterwards known as Thessaly. Fleeing before the Thessalians and the Boetians go the Dorians, who in turn conquer the Peloponnesus. One district only seems to have been left to the Pelasgi—the mountain district in the center of the Peloponnesus—the district of Arcadia. But the Dorians became the masters of the peninsula and made it their home. The Achæans, fleeing from the despoiling Dorians, themselves despoiled the Ionians and gave the name Achaia to the southern shore of the Corinthian Gulf. The Dorians also attempted to conquer Athens, but the city was saved—so runs the story—by the heroic sacrifice of Codrus its king. Those inhabitants of the land who surrendered to the Dorians were allowed to retain their possessions, but were forced to pay tribute and were deprived of any participation in the government; while those who had to be subdued by arms were made slaves—Helots; many, however, preferred to flee from their native land, and these estab-

lished colonies in Asia Minor on the shores of the sea they loved.

So, the picture we have of Hellas at this time is that of a mainland peopled by the stocks just mentioned, and of a large number of small communities or colonies well established along the shores of Asia Minor, in Italy and Sicily, and in various other places. Flight from stronger forces was not the only or even the chief reason for the colonizing activities of these Hellenes. Their insatiable curiosity—love of adventure—desire for trade—overpopulation—poverty of soil—political disturbances—all these play their part in this relatively wide dispersion of the Greeks. Scattered as these Greeks were, it must be remembered that they were one people in racial consciousness and in pride of cultural union. Most of the colonies prospered to such an extent that they became mothers of new colonies—the tide of immigration ebbing and flowing—until they numbered in 600 B.C. about two hundred and fifty.

Strange as it may seem, Greek history is, in its main interest to us, the history of two peoples of Greece—the Dorians and the Ionians—and of their city-states: Sparta of the former, and the immortal Athens of the latter, two moderate-sized towns, but destined to loom large in the story of the development of our civilization. Let us consider Sparta first. Tho of considerably less

importance than Athens, it first rose to prominence in the history of Greece.

The city-state of Sparta—an area of about one hundred miles square—was enclosed by mountains opening out southward through two narrow necks to the sea. Thus it was peculiarly self-contained, and finely protected from its enemies. It was formed out of the union of five villages, which found it to their mutual advantage to unite into a single city-state. The inhabitants were composed of three classes: (1) the Helots, (2) the Laconians, (3) the Spartans proper—the original conquerors.

The Helots—as previously stated—were the former inhabitants of the land who stubbornly refused to flee from the Spartans—unwilling to expatriate themselves—and were consequently reduced to slaves; hated and despised, forced to wear a special slave-costume as a token of their servitude. Whenever they showed signs of revolting, the Spartan young men exercised their prowess upon them as a sort of military exercise.

The Laconians were much more favorably treated. Composing in the main the populations of about one hundred towns, they made discretion the better part of valor, and subjected themselves to their conquerors. While they were given no political rights, nevertheless their lot was not too hard. For the landed property they were permitted to hold, they were given the privilege of paying rent or tribute to the state,

and no impediments were placed in the way of practising their trades or of developing their arts.

The Dorians, or the Spartans, forming but a small portion of the entire population, dwelt within their city-state, which was virtually nothing more nor less than an open camp. Within the limits of their territory was some of the most fertile land, worked by the Helots, while the Spartans devoted themselves solely to the affairs of their state, and to the arts of war.

Of the early history of Sparta we know practically nothing that may be relied upon. The Spartans' own story runs to the effect that their first king, dying, left two sons to rule their city-state. Such an unsatisfactory arrangement led to civil wars, bringing about its decline. About 850 B.C. a man arose with sufficient strength of character and organizing ability to lay the foundations of a state which was destined to last many centuries and attain much fame. Even tho the existence of this man, Lycurgus, has been disputed, there seems to be no good reason to discard as entirely worthless all the records concerning him.

Lycurgus, who established the new constitution and was Sparta's first great law-giver, was reputed to have been the uncle of one of these kings. Because of the prevailing disorders, he was given the kingship, which he held for the space of eight months. Resigning the position at

the close of this period, because of sinister designs against him, he set sail for Crete, Asia, and Egypt. While on his travels he became a close student of government, especially the government of Crete. Here he saw the people living frugally upon the simple necessities of life. In Egypt he is supposed to have expressed admiration for their system of separating the military from the civil men. Returning to his native state he immediately set about the task of establishing a constitution and a body of laws within which would be incorporated the best he had seen, with the elimination of the weaker and less desirable elements.

This new constitution was built upon the express intention of making the Spartan city-state a military state pure and simple. Its government rested solely in the hands of the Spartans themselves. Retaining a dual kingship, it divested the kings of much authority save in the time of war, when into their hands fell the direction of the army. But the most important of the new institutions was the Council, consisting of twenty-eight elders, elected by Spartans who had reached the age of thirty. This Council *checkmated* the kings whenever they were inclined to encroach upon the people's liberty; and on the other hand, stood with the kings when the people overstepped their bounds. Five ephors, or overseers, were appointed to maintain law and order. The power of these overseers grew so strong

that in time they even subjected the kings to their control.

As previously stated, the aim of the constitution was to produce a hardy, thrifty race of fighters, with almost a superhuman capacity for bearing pain without flinching, and of enduring hardships without complaint. To this end there was instituted the use of public tables, where all were to eat in common of the same meat, and of such provisions as were stipulated. There was to be no supplementing of this simple fare by surreptitiously eating at home.

Looking upon the education of the youth as the most important of the functions of the state, Lycurgus laid down minute regulations governing life before its inception, at birth, through youth to marriage. Due to the fact that the men were so much engaged in war or in preparation for it, and were so busy upon the affairs of the state, the women had a much freer time than in most of the other Greek city-states. But regulations also ordered their lives in order that they might become fit mothers of Spartan men. The young women had to exercise themselves in wrestling—in running—in throwing quoits and darts—so as to make them strong and vigorous. One is supposed to have remarked to the wife of Leonidas: "You of Lacedæmon are the only women in the world who rule the men." She replied: "We are the only women who bring forth men."

Whenever a child was born the father was compelled to take it before the ancient men for examination. Should the child stand the test, and prove its fitness to become a true Spartan, it was given back to the mother for rearing and education. But, should it be weakly or in any way deformed, it was ordered to be thrown into a deep cavern near Mount Taygetus. The babe that was strong and well-proportioned was given the utmost care and attention by its mother and nurse. The limbs of the babes were never swathed in tightly-bound clothes, but were given perfect freedom so that they could kick about as much as they pleased. Fancy baby diets were tabu. Babies were given all kinds of meats to practise their digestive organs on. There was no such thing as youngsters crying for a light, for they were accustomed to see no terrors in the dark. Any kind of ill-humor or unmanly, unspartan crying was cut short at once, so that there were no unnecessary bedroom parades in midnight hours.

At the age of seven the boys were taken from their homes, enrolled in companies, kept in order, and thoroughly disciplined, enjoying all their exercises and recreations in common. The most courageous among them was made captain, while the others bore as patiently as possible the punishments the young martinet imposed upon them. The older men took a keen interest in observing the growth of these youths into the full stature

of Spartan men. Being trained for war, their education along other lines was negligible. It was necessary for them to steal their food—or else go without. This, in order that they might early learn to forage for themselves, thus anticipating their needs as fighting soldiers in enemy lands.

Thus all through their lives they were subject to minute regulations, living laborious days; low living, but one cannot add high thinking. What issue came of all this as far as Sparta was concerned? For several centuries she seemed to have realized in a measure the objective set by the constitution and the laws of Lycurgus. But she nevertheless stands as an object lesson for all time of the fact that the imposition of a rigid, inflexible constitution, where liberty of opinion and of expression are suppressed, brings its own nemesis. Liberty was sacrificed on the altar of efficiency for war; consequently, while she existed for centuries she lived not at all. When the time came, as come it had to, when respect and allegiance to her constitution weakened, when the toughness of her moral fiber began to disintegrate, she rapidly passed to a hopeless decadence. As in many another case, everything was taken into consideration save the deep-lying instincts of human nature. As Rousseau said of Lycurgus, "His laws completely changed the nature of man to make of him a citizen." Not completely, but sufficiently to cripple whatever

possibilities of initiative might remain. There was its weakness—where it was thought its main strength resided. The citizens, regulated almost every moment of their lives, lost all power of initiative and became mere cogs in a machine doomed to be rendered useless by the progressive peoples that surrounded them. This mighty Sparta stands in the center of Greece—as viewed by history—as a dark, benighted, and barbaric state. To her honor let us tell of her valor in battle, her contempt for pain and suffering and death. But withal she has left to civilization the achievement of no artist—no man of letters—no genius of any kind—while her ruins have long since passed to the indistinguishable dust.

Very different is the story we have to tell of Athens. Athens was the chief city of Attica, comprising the southeast corner of Middle Greece, about sixty miles in length, and in its breadth at the widest point about twenty-four miles. The population of the country was of a mixed character: Pelasgi, Acheans, Æolians, but chiefly Ionians. On the death of Codrus, who sacrificed his life for his city, the Athenians claimed that no man henceforth was worthy to occupy the throne he had so gloriously vacated. So monarchy was closed, and in its place the office of Archon was established. In time ten Archons were elected from the nobility to serve for a period of ten years.

So much power, however, in the hands of a

few men presages no ultimate good to the common people. Demos, finding his voice in the discovery of his strength, demanded laws written down so that all men might read, trusting no longer to the convenient and accommodating memory of the Rememberer. The peremptory demand of the people was half-heartedly heeded by the nobles, and Draco, of their number, was commissioned to draw them up. Legend says they were written in blood. Peoples have ever since called all harsh and cruel laws Draconic. Naturally, the heady Athenians soon spoke their minds—and blood began to flow in earnest. Relief came when Solon—one of the wiser of the Athenians, himself a noble—drew up a code of laws more humane, democratic, and just. Large numbers of Athenians were hopelessly in debt; and the selling of the debtor to slavery as payment of debt was common. Henceforth no Athenian could be sold for debt; and many of the poorer people were freed of a portion of their burdens.

The Popular Assembly—in which was vested the chief governing authority—elected a council of four hundred, and also appointed the judges. Dividing the population into four classes, according to their wealth, Solon gave to the nobility the positions in the High Court—known as the Areopagus—as well as the office of Archon. Solon now made the Athenians take a solemn oath that ten years must elapse before

changes could be made in the constitution. In order to escape from the complaints and questions and quarrels of his fellow citizens, Solon thought it wise to take himself away for awhile, thus giving the constitution a chance to work itself out.

But during his absence the people of Athens grouped themselves about certain leaders, some of the nobles even going over to champion the cause of the poor. The dominance of the aristocratic nobles was upset by these time-serving demagogs; and pushing their advantage to the limit, they became sole rulers. These men the Greek called *Tyrants,* tho the word did not necessarily bear the meaning that we attach to it to-day, for some of the tyrants were benevolent and humane. One of the most famous of all such benevolent tyrants was Pisistratus—courteous, fair-spoken, benevolent towards the poor, fair to his enemies. Another famous tyrant was Cleisthenes, the champion of the democratic party, who revised the laws of Solon, making them less aristocratic and the constitution more conformable to the wishes of his party. He also introduced the remarkable innovation of ostracism. By this means any citizen could be banished for ten years without trial, defense, or any special accusation against him. More often than not a citizen considered ostracism more of a compliment than otherwise, for it indicated that he was considered, by reason of his power and prestige,

dangerous to the well-being of the state. The citizens wrote the name of the man whom they desired to see banished, upon a shell or potsherd, and placed it in a receptacle at the voting place. He was given ten days to make all his plans and to arrange his affairs—then exile for the good of his state and the preservation of democratic institutions.

The wars against Persia mark one of the great periods in Greek history. As we have previously stated, the Greeks in their mastery of the art of seamanship had spread themselves about the coasts of Asia Minor, establishing settlements wherever they deemed it desirable. The development and extension of these colonies had aroused the fear and animosity of the great inland power to such an extent that Persia deemed it prudent to subject to her rule these turbulent and indomitable Greeks. So Darius ordered one of his generals to cross the Hellespont into Greece itself to subdue the entire country. Here was the meeting in battle array of East and West. Which was going to win? To the everlasting glory of the Greeks be it said, that tho their country was divided up into small city-states, each with its own intense individualism and equally intense jealousy of the others, yet they temporarily laid aside their differences and fought enthusiastically side by side in behalf of their political independence. Was Oriental despotism going to be the instrument to stamp

out western culture at its birth? The answer is to be found in the repulse of these Orientals at Marathon by the valiant Athenians—an event of such major importance as to give it a place as one of the great decisive battles of the world. No wonder the Greeks were never tired of celebrating it!

Time would fail to tell the story of Thermopylæ, of Salamis, of Platæa, of Mycale, which all added to the glory of Greece, and saved for posterity the achievements of its unmatched culture. On sea—which the Persians had a most childish dread of—the same story was told. In order that the ardor of Darius might know no slackening, a slave had daily to call out in stentorian tones the reminder of his oath of destruction of these upstart Greeks: "Master, remember the Athenians."

But, no sooner was the Persian danger removed than we have a return to the characteristic turmoils of Athenian political life. These, however, are silenced, and unity again prevails as the news is flashed that Xerxes, son of Darius, is moving with a vast army across the Hellespont. But it was on the lap of the gods that the West was to conquer the East, and that love of freedom was to prove more mighty than the forces of despotism.

The years pass by, and in their passing we note that the leadership of Greek forces imperceptibly passes from the unimaginative Spartans

into the hands of the dynamic Athenians. Athens flourishes apace, both from the standpoint of her wealth and power in material things, and more particularly from the standpoint of her wealth in things created of the spirit.

Never again was Greece to rise to such dizzy heights as during the period so fittingly called the Age of Pericles. This remarkable man gave early indications of a mind formed for great things. Well born, with ample fortune, he had devoted himself with energy to intellectual pursuits—not for personal pleasure, but as equipment for statesmanship. From the time when he first appeared in the Assembly he ever sought to court the favor of the multitude, but sought no less by his demeanor, and unremitting attention to the business of the state, to command its respect. The wars that followed his assumption to office found him directing his energies to raising Athens to the position of chief state in Greece. He gave the direction of the army to Cimon, his great rival, whom he recalled from exile in order to lead an expedition against Persia.

Sparta, morosely nursing its jealousy against the rising power of Athens, found occasion to vent its spleen against the Athenians, and in a series of battles won a signal victory at Coronea. Pericles hastened to conclude a peace treaty in which two hegemonies were to be recognized—one under Sparta and the other under Athens.

Athens became the mistress of the seas—but Sparta master of the land.

In this Periclean Age we find the power and splendor of Athens at its zenith. Wherever genius and talent could be found, a welcome awaited it at Athens. The citizens, in their justifiable pride, found in education and intellectual enlightenment the means not only of distinguishing themselves, but of adding their quota to the glory of their city. To such a high state had this been developed that Pericles found it safe to allow numbers of the great offices of the state to be filled by lot cast by the people. The architectural magnificence of the city, when we recall the Parthenon, the Propylæa, and other famous buildings and magnificent temples, immediately comes to mind. So it is not to be wondered at that Gladstone should have replied to the question, "At what period of the world's history would you prefer to have lived, Mr. Gladstone?" —after a moment's hesitation—"The Age of Pericles."

Unfortunately, the pomp and circumstance of yesterday—the great achievements of the relatively peaceful age of Pericles—the amazing productions of the most cultured people of the ancient world—are all cast in the shadows of a deep sadness when one passes into a day in which internal dissensions and interstate jealousies mark decay. Greece is about to commit suicide,

and the pathos is heightened by the fact that she was unconscious of it.

The Peace of Pericles could not last, as he knew full well when he concluded it. Not that the differences between Sparta and Athens were incapable of a wise adjustment, but solely because the undisciplined temperaments of the peoples themselves would not admit of it. Persia, standing in the background, lending its might to this side and that, as best served its dark design, bided its time for the overthrow of its enemy. At the same time the Greek cities attached themselves to their respective champions in accord with their private desires.

The story of the long-drawn-out Peloponnesian wars—of the plague—of the death of Pericles—of the disastrous expedition of the brilliant but unscrupulous Alcibiades into Sicily—is punctuated by splendid victories, by examples of great valor, but also by great miseries and much humiliation. When the news came of the terrible defeat at Syracuse, the whole republic was thrown into the deeps of consternation and despair. Throughout the city—along the walls leading to the Piræus—could be heard wild cries of woe and fury as the populace railed against the orators, the divines, and the politicians. Thenceforward the barometer rises and falls; successes and failures go on until the fall of Athens. When surrounded by land and sea, she is forced to surrender. With the surrender of

the navy goes also the control of the seas. But twelve vessels are left to her. Then, as tho her humiliation were not complete, she must recognize the hegemony of her ancient rival, and enter the Spartan confederacy.

So passed the greatness and the glory of Athens. Lysander abolished the Athenian constitution, and set up in its place a government by thirty aristocrats—known as the rule of the Thirty Tyrants.

Lycurgus, the founder of the Spartan constitution, sought to make each part of the life of Sparta a well-regulated portion of the life of the whole. But human nature revolted, and ere long we see deviations from the laws pertaining to property and to the simplicity of life. Power accumulated in the hands of a few rich families, the controllers of the destinies both of Sparta and of its dependencies. And in consequence thereof those Greek city-states which had rejoiced in the act of throwing off the Athenian yoke now realized that they had exchanged staves for scorpions. In Athens the rule of the tyrants, stained with blood, stirred up the spirit of the Athenians, and under the leadership of Thebes the tyrants were defeated. Democratic government was installed, but the democratic spirit of justice and fair play, of honesty and integrity, seemed to have passed. In such an atmosphere it was easy to convict Socrates of crimes he never committed, skeptic tho he was.

Condemned to drink the cup of hemlock, he yet remained in spirit to chasten men's memories and to inspire two such great minds as Plato and Aristotle.

The great power of Persia was in the meantime gradually disintegrating through inherent weakness and corruption. She had stood on the side of Sparta against Athens, and in return for the assistance rendered, the Spartans rallied to the cause of Cyrus, the younger son of Darius, who sought to gain the Persian throne from the hands of his brother Artaxerxes. But in the battle on the plain of Cunaxa Cyrus lost his life, and in consequence, the Asiatics passed over to the side of Artaxerxes. The Greeks were forced to retreat, and to endure so much hardship that the Retreat of the Ten Thousand, as written in the *Anabasis* by their leader Xenophon, is one of the most thrilling stories coming to us from ancient times. But the matter could not rest there—Persia must be avenged against Sparta. So Tissaphernes, the Persian leader, demanded that the terms of a former treaty entered into between Sparta and Persia should be met—the Ionian cities must be surrendered to her. But the Ionian cities also had something to say in the matter; so, with assistance from Sparta, a war ensued. Seizing the opportunity, Athens and Thebes, together with Corinth and Argos, found it to their advantage to throw off the yoke of Sparta. Assisted by Persian money, and

moved by an indomitable spirit, the allies won on sea and crushed Sparta's power on land. Athens was rebuilt—this time by Persian gold—and for a time it seemed as tho she were to move out of the shadows into the light of her brilliant past. But it was not to be; the Athenian Empire was a thing of the past. The fortunes of the Greeks ran this way and that, until the genius of the Theban leader Epaminondas made possible the rise of the Theban hegemony. Thebes began to dream dreams and to see visions of future glories on sea and land. Democracy was everywhere to be the master of aristocracy, and a light that never was on sea or land should radiate from Thebes. Unfortunately for these dreams, the great Theban leader was mortally wounded in battle; and with his passing there passed also the hegemony of Thebes, and the supremacy of this city-state. Henceforth exhausted Greece fell apart into numbers of small states, without union, and entirely dependent upon the initiative of brilliant but isolated leaders, so that she presented herself as fair prey to any foreign invader. The invader was soon to come, but the story of his coming belongs with the story of the rise of Macedonia.

It is an impossible task to gather together into a comprehensive statement the legacies left to civilization by this most brilliant people. We found civilization before the coming of the Greeks typically Eastern; with them it becomes

definitely Western. Its genius was so manifold, virile, profuse, human, intimate, that we find no difficulty in appropriating it and calling it our own. Its confident intellectual explorations through all the realms of human curiosity are as fearless as a child wandering through rooms in a darkness it has never learned to fear. In fact, they seem to have been the only people in the past, and perhaps in all time, who were perfectly at home in the world. All lovers of beauty treasure their imperishable art; those who seek freedom, who think in terms of democracy and humanity, drink from those ancient well-springs. Their intellectual and artistic achievements reveal to us the Olympian heights of human possibilities. Did Nature extend herself in a too-generous distribution among these people, or did she wish to intimate to us that what she gave once to them she can give again to others?

We have great love and veneration for the Athenian because of his culture, his love of freedom and of the beautiful, his artistic instincts and artistic achievements. Athens, the Peter Pan of peoples, always a child, refusing to grow up! We can love even its weaknesses and faults.

V

ALEXANDER THE GREAT AND THE HELLENISTIC EMPIRE

We have said that the only unity the Greeks ever had was that of race and culture. Political unions lasted only as long as dangers threatened the independence of their city-states; and these were not so much political as military. This deliberate refusal of the Greeks to build up a strong unified nation was one of the causes of their downfall. What they failed to do, however, was accomplished for them by the rising power of Macedonia under the leadership of Philip, and his more brilliant son, Alexander.

The Hellenes had never looked upon the half-barbaric peoples of Macedonia as entitled to the name of Greek. When they could no longer hold out against the power of Philip, they perforce granted him and his people official recognition. This was convenient and tactful; for when the day of Philip's subjugation of Greece came about they looked upon it, not as a conquest by a foreign power, but simply as the establishment of another Greek hegemony under the leadership of Macedonia. Now, Macedonia had never had any considerable part in Greek affairs or in Greek culture. Her nobles and her kings had long since endeavored to engraft the culture,

habits, and customs of the Greeks upon their rude stock, but without much success. Macedonia was invited to take part in the Olympic games, but we have no record of any great Macedonian victories there.

The rise of Macedonia was due to Philip, a lover of all things Greek, a great soldier, and a worthy man. His heart was greatly stirred within him as he looked on the prostrate condition of the Greek city-states, on their dissensions and jealousies, and on Persia, to whom he credited much of the miseries of Hellas. Why should not Macedonia assume the leadership, and he, as king, win the right to lead a victorious army against the hated Persians? He had spent a few years as a hostage of Thebes, during which he became a willing and brilliant student of Epaminondas, the great Theban general. On his return to his native land he immediately set about the task he had assigned himself—to educate, discipline, and lead a Macedonian army to a supreme position in Greece, and to bring about the total discomfiture of Persia's empire. Within Macedonia he proved his organizing and soldierly qualities by rescuing the land from invaders, kept the throne out of the hands of false claimants, and stamped out intrigues and conspiracies in high places. The people rallied to his support, and recognized in him the fit ruler of their lands.

The Athenians, however, did not look upon

Philip as the morning star of a fresh reformation in Greek affairs; rather did they look on him as an ominous cloud looming out of the northern darkness, which if not immediately dissipated would engulf them in fresh humiliation and deeper miseries. Accordingly, the Athenians formed defensive and offensive alliances with other city-states against this northern menace, and aimed to crush the new power in its cradle. But Philip, moving with characteristic swiftness to the frontiers, brought the barbarian allies of Athens to terms, and reduced them, ere they were ready to strike, to a condition of subjection. Nothing would have suited Philip better than to gain his supremacy over Greece by peaceful, diplomatic means. One stumbling-block stood in his way—the fiery, impassioned, closely-knit eloquence of Demosthenes, the self-constituted champion of Athenian democracy and of Athenian freedom. So, if the place of arbitration is to be the battlefield and not the conference-room, Philip is ready, tho reluctant to strike his fellow Greeks. On the field at Chæronea Philip showed that the sword could speak more eloquently, when occasion required, than pen or tongue.

When all this had been satisfactorily accomplished, Philip moved forward to engage in a war infinitely more to his liking, and for which he had planned and dreamed—that against Persia. But it was not to be; at least, he was not to

be the leader, for the treacherous hand of an assassin struck him down at the moment when his preparations were complete and his army ready.

It has been said of Philip that "His character was to be without character in disposition and action; his principles, to have no principles and everywhere to dissemble his aims; his habits, to accustom him to nothing, but solely to follow the inspirations of the moment; his strength, to remain master of himself in every condition and proceeding, and, in a thousand other causes and consequences of weakness, to follow his chief plan unchanged and to lead everything around him, whilst to the short-sighted he appeared to be led by all." "Philip," says another, "accomplished the greatest deeds of all the Macedonian kings who reigned before and after him, and also broke more oaths and violated more covenants." However that may be—and we must remember that most of what we know of Philip has come from the unfriendly lips of Athenians—Philip found Macedonia a semi-barbaric country, and at his death Macedonian supremacy was a recognized fact. It would be interesting to speculate upon what might have happened in Greek affairs had the stormy eloquence of Demosthenes found answer in a Greek army led by the genius of Epaminondas. Would the new order of battle, the phalanx, invented by Philip, have then succeeded? Who knows?

With the death of Philip, Alexander, the son of Philip and Olympias, ascends the throne. Of all the famous conquerors of history no one of them has appealed more widely to the imagination of men than the youthful Alexander. For sheer dramatic power, who is it that can match him? The gods had been lavish to him in their gifts, and the exercise of them caught the wondering admiration of his time. At his birth his father, Philip, wrote to Aristotle:

> Philip to Aristotle wishes Health.
>
> I am to acquaint you, that a son is born to me, nor do I thank the gods so much for his birth, as for his being born in your time. I hope that when he shall have been educated and instructed by you, he shall be worthy of us, and fit to succeed to so great a kingdom. For I think it much better to be without children, than to beget them for a punishment and educate them to the shame and dishonor of their ancestors.

This great teacher, Aristotle, brought to young Alexander the best fruits of the culture of the Greeks, while his father instructed him in all the arts of warfare and fine generalship. The disciple was eminently worthy of his teachers, and proved himself a true Greek in his amazing powers of assimilation. Brave, generous, and every inch a king—notwithstanding his passionate outbursts and his occasional spasms of cruelty—he was to carry forward his

father's designs probably beyond the wildest dreams the latter ever entertained.

When Alexander assumed the mantle of his father, some of the Greeks thought it a fitting opportunity to break away from their Macedonian leaders, and Demosthenes even went to the extent of treating with the Persians, accepting their gold to aid the revolt. But they did not know their Alexander, youth tho he was. With the swiftness of an eagle, he turned about, and before preparations for revolt could go forward very far, he arrived at Thebes and awed the rebels into submission. Athens deemed it prudent to follow suit. An amusing touch of irony is seen in the fact that Demosthenes was sent as a member of the embassy to meet Alexander and to convey to him their apologies; tho after he had traveled some distance he decided to turn back, fearing possibly an impairment in his health should he proceed.

Greece and Macedonia engaged the active attention of Alexander for the next two years, owing to the insubordination of some tribes and the machinations of his enemies. Choosing Thebes as a special example, he completely razed the city, sparing only the temple and the home of the poet Pindar. So Thebes is a memory, and her streets are become heaps of desolation; she has gone where Sparta is to follow.

Having made Thebes a terrible example of his

vengeance, a witness of what might come to other recalcitrant cities, Alexander had the satisfaction of seeing all the Greeks now come forward humbly to extend their apologies, to recant their vows made in ignorance, and to submit their destinies to his hands.

All this made it possible for Alexander to turn his attention once more to the East, to begin his victorious expeditions against the Persians. Once again West meets East and the die is cast. But now 'tis the West that moves towards the East with confidence in every step, and with assurance in every heart. Time has dealt unkindly with Persia, for she is aged and tottering, and her pride in her past avails her nothing when the mighty fighting machine of the Macedonia army goes crashing on from victory to victory. Her empire crumbles to dust, and upon the dust these valiant Greeks plant their banners. At Gordium, the capital city of Phrygia, was a royal chariot reported to have belonged to King Midas. The oracle had declared that whoever should unfasten the peculiarly twisted knot about the chariot, should become master of all Asia. It was left to Alexander to solve the problem of the Gordian knot by cutting it with his sword. This conquest in Syria brought him vast quantities of the spoils of war left by the hurrying Persians. So rapid was the flight of Darius that he was forced to leave behind his mother, wife, and children. These, however, were treated

by Alexander with the greatest respect and consideration. Tyre and all Phenicia fell to his hands, then Syria and Egypt.

Alexander's reception in Egypt was more of a hearty welcome than anything else; for the Egyptians had wasted no love on the Persians, and they were only too glad to welcome one who would prove to be a more generous master. This possession of Egypt is forever memorable, if for no other reason than that of the establishing of the city of Alexandria, destined to play a great part in the history of civilization.

Ancient Greek legends, dear to the hearts of the Greeks and probably to Alexander, told of the marvelous adventure of Hercules and Perseus. These two had gone out into the heart of the Libyan desert in order to consult the oracle of Ammon. Perhaps in this fact, among other reasons, may be found the secret of the march of Alexander and his army into the Libyan desert in order to consult that famous oracle. At any rate, when he arrived he was conducted within the sacred temple, where the questions he put to the chief priest were answered to his satisfaction. What those questions were, Alexander would not disclose; but the probability is that he gathered the gratifying information that he was a son of Jupiter, with no reflections cast upon his mother. From this Libyan experience some would mark the beginning of that strange obsession of his, which seemed to develop as the

years passed, to orientalize himself as much as possible in dress, in habits, and in his acceptance of the worship of his person by Orientals whom he must have secretly despised. Was it all a part of the play? We know that he tried all means at his disposal to win the conquered over to his confidence, trust, and loyal obedience. Perhaps the army misunderstood the intent of their king when they openly protested against his wearing the Median dress, his affectation of Persian court functions, and his acceptance of adulation due only to a god, from the millions of Asia. Answers to all such questions are listed according to the likes and dislikes of the person of Alexander himself.

But success in arms was as a fever in his blood. His feet itched to be on the march again, for his love of conquest knew no bounds. The Persian Empire being now firmly in his hand, he pushed on to possess its eastern provinces—Bactria, Logdiana, etc. He set up a new Alexandria on the river Jaxartes. In Logdiana he took as prisoner the Bactrian princess Roxana, and forthwith bound her in the bonds of matrimony. There also, in a fit of ungovernable wrath, he murdered his friend Clitus; who, exercising the privileges of friendship, had contradicted him. This friend had saved Alexander's life by cutting off the sword arm of one who was in the act of striking him from behind. An extenuating cause of this vile deed of Alexander may be

found in the fact that he had dined all too well, and that both men were in the early stages of intoxication. Let us add that no sooner was the bleeding body of his friend lying before him, with the horror-stricken eyes of the company upon him, than he rushed out of the hall, retired to bed, and there passed three days in agony, not caring for food or drink, denouncing himself as unworthy to live after perpetrating such a foul murder. His friends finally prevailed on him to take food, and to seek an anodyne for his grief in new activities.

The conquest of Bactria being complete, Alexander turned his attention to the last remaining province of the Persian Empire, India. In spite of the grumblings of his Macedonian troops, he led his conquering army through the Punjab, and would have proceeded all the way down to the Ganges, but his soldiers would have none of it. Even their horses' hoofs were worn away by their continual marches, and to what purpose? Were they ever going to return to their homes in distant Macedonia? The possibility is that they might have kept going if they had been satisfied as to its necessity, or if there had appeared to be some final issue to the campaigns. Silent murmurings found voice in significant mutterings. Home sounded sweet in their ears; and the sound crystallized to a firm determination not to proceed one step further through this dismal land of India, the very rim of the

world. For three days this insatiable Alexander remained in his tent waiting for his men to change their minds; but the stillness brooding over the camp—a stillness that might presage a storm—told him that yielding must come from his tent, not from theirs.

On his way back Alexander founded several cities to tie together his conquests, and to become radiating centers of Greek culture. Going through the uncharted deserts of Beluchistan, his army endured indescribable hardships, a large number of the men perishing by reason of excessive heat and tormenting thirst. In order to encourage and set an example before his men, Alexander, ready to drop from the heat, and parched with thirst, marched at the head of his distressed army, enduring all that they endured, and second to none in the exhibition of courage and endurance. A pretty story is told of him, similar in some respects to the story told of David in the Old Testament. It was the custom to send out parties to seek for water, and these returned more often than not without discovering any. One day, some soldiers in their search for water found a small, muddy pool, almost dry. Dipping a shield into the little pool, they presented the water to their valiant king as a rare and costly gift. Thanking those who brought it, he poured it immediately upon the ground before the eyes of the entire army. This noble example of kingly willingness to endure the

common lot, so moved his men, that his very self-denial seemed to refresh them as tho each had dipped his cup into a well.

Passing through these exhausting experiences, the remnant of the army at last came to a more fruitful land, thence to Carmania. Aspastes had been given the rule over this territory, but as he was suspected of intrigues against Alexander it was necessary that the king should take the government into his own hands. During the long absence of Alexander, there had been a widespread increase of crimes and violence: pillaging the public funds, violating the sanctity of temples, lust and avarice had become the order of the day; in short, the rule of the satraps had been restored. Alexander immediately set about the task of punishing the faithless governors who had restored despotic and cruel government on the assumption that their king would never return from the wilds of India. Here also he burdened his old veterans with rich gifts, and sent them to their Macedonian homes to end their days in peace and comfort.

Selecting Babylon as his capital, he set out on the colossal task of ruling his mighty empire, which stretched from the Ionian Sea to faraway India. With the vision of a statesman and the energy of a conqueror, he set about the task of welding East and West into one great empire.

An early story in the Old Testament tells of the confusion of tongues, the dispersion of the

peoples, that occurred when they set about the erection of a high tower that should reach to heaven—the tower of Babel. It was here at Babylon—whose name means "Confusion"—that Alexander set about his ambitious task of bringing the confusion of tongues and the clash of interests to an end by making one nation out of many peoples. To this end he set an example by marrying the eldest daughter of Darius and the youngest daughter of Artaxerxes Ochus. Ten thousand of his men are supposed to have followed his example; tho many of them felt that the comforts of a retired life, in their homes in Macedonia, would be disturbed if they brought their Eastern wives and children back with them.

While these projects were going forward, they were nevertheless but minor parts of a larger plan. Arabia must be added as a jewel to Alexander's crown; and distant, thriving Phenician Carthage, on the North African shore of the Mediterranean, must perforce give up its isolation and take its place within this Empire. Man proposes, but oftentimes another power over which he has no control disposes. Alexander's life at thirty-three had had more packed into it than ordinarily falls to the lot of the most adventurous life privileged to live its normal span of three-score years and ten. The rigors of his never-ceasing expeditions, the cares and responsibilities of office, the too-frequent celebrations

at the shrine of Bacchus, all contributed their quota to a weakening of his natural powers of resistance when fever gripped him. On the eleventh day of June, 323 B.C., while not yet thirty-three years of age, he passed away. A few days before he died some of his friends asked him, to whom did he wish to leave the Empire? He replied, "To the worthiest."

As in the case of most other great men, there is a wide diversity of opinion respecting the qualities and achievements of Alexander. One distinguished writer says: "So ended he whom they call Alexander the Great. Let the name stand; but he owed his greatness not to his personal qualities, to his own efforts or to his genius, but, as Plutarch admitted, to Fortune." Yes; but who is Fortune? And why should she have been the Lady Bountiful to this particular youth? Another says that "his soul was built on a scale that surpassed human measure." So it goes, and you may take your choice. This, however, we can say: he was the first European successfully to lead the West against the East, and to subject the East to his will. By this he broke down barriers which perhaps never since have been completely reerected. While his empire disintegrated at his death, and while he never saw the realization of what may be accepted as impossible dreams of Western and Eastern fusion, nevertheless, a man should not be entirely judged by his actual achievements, for by such a test some

of the greatest idealists in the world must be counted out. Alexander carried with him the seeds of Greek culture, and sowed these seeds wherever he found appropriate ground. The influences of his policy were all directed, politically speaking, away from the Greek conception of a small city-state to an empire infinitely better suited to advance the cause of civilization. Even his tutor, Aristotle, never stepped outside of the vision of a small city-state as the largest conceivable political unit within which the rights of democracy, and the privileges of culture, could best be served. But such a conception was antiquated; its evils were plainly evidenced in Greece itself. So, while Alexander left no great institution resting on a sound foundation, no firmly-knit organization capable of functioning under changing conditions, no abiding form of government fit for an empire, yet his death marks a definite point in the transition stages of the civilizing process. It is a fascinating conjecture as to what civilization and the world would have looked like had this brilliant soldier and statesman been privileged to live out his life to a round old age.

The Successors of Alexander

Alexander left no heir to take his place. He had a number of men about him who felt loyalty to the king, but they would bend to no other, for each thought himself capable of wear-

ing the purple. These men began to quarrel among themselves, as Alexander knew they would, before his body was cold. Not only so, but the royal family of Macedonia was wiped out to the last person. Twenty years of strife after the death of Alexander broke the empire into three parts. Macedonia, including Greece, went to Antigonidæ; the Asiatic kingdom passed to the Seleucidæ, while Egypt passed to the Ptolemies.

The Greeks could never bring themselves meekly to accept the Macedonian yoke about their necks. Time after time, even during Alexander's rule, they strove to free themselves, but could never quite accomplish it; and after his passing it was difficult for them to realize that the great powers of the Macedonians were far superior to anything they could muster. City-states they always remained; but independence was impossible, if only because their poverty made the financing of mercenary armies a burden beyond their capacity to bear. After the Lamian war (323-322) Athens was compelled to submit, and the indomitable Demosthenes was forced to flee the city. But the hands of Antipater—through his exile-hunters—were stretched out to take him. They found him in the temple at Calaurea, where he preferred death in the form of poison, self-administered, than to fall into the hands of his torturing enemies.

A few years later the Athenians raised a statue to his memory bearing the following inscription:

> HAD BUT THE STRENGTH OF THY ARM, DEMOSTHENES, EQUALED THY SPIRIT, NEVER WOULD GREECE HAVE SUNK UNDER THE FOREIGNER'S YOKE.

A new power was slowly rising in the West; and, taking advantage of the dissension within Greece, the legions of Rome took possession of the country and made it a Roman Province. Macedonia was compelled also to submit in 148 B.C.

When the empire of Alexander was finally divided into three parts, twenty or so years after his death, the largest part fell to Seleucus, one of Alexander's generals. Making Babylon his first capital, he restored again the prestige of Macedonian arms over most of the Asiatic territory comprised within the empire. Some time later, after the erection of the famed city of Antioch, a city which matched the glory of Alexandria, he selected it for his capital. Other nations, however, were rising to power, particularly the Parthians. So that before many years had passed by, the Seleucid empire began slowly to disintegrate, but not before it had served a most useful purpose in disseminating Greek culture and civilization. The rapid development of Rome as the great western power made it impossible for the Seleucidæ to play any very important part in world history. In 63 B.C. Rome added

the territory to its own, thus bringing to a close the Seleucid dynasty, which had ruled from about 312 B.C to 63 B.C.

From many standpoints Ptolemy received the choice portion when Alexander's pie was divided. He made a wise choice in selecting Egypt, for he and his descendants were to rule over Egypt for no less than three centuries. A great general of wide and deep culture, a wise ruler, a credible historian, he proved himself capable of administering the affairs of his kingdom, and of developing and spreading the productive genius of the Greeks. In the beautiful city of Alexandria he established the famous library—extended and enriched by his descendants—which was to house the most famous collection of books that had ever been brought together in one place. It contained no less than 700,000 manuscripts. Connected with the library was a college of research, to which were invited the most famous scholars of the time. Alexandria became the new Athens of Greek life, from which flowed a steady stream of cultural influences in literature, philosophy, and science. It was not only a great Greek city, but also the greatest Hebrew city in the world. Here were translated, from the Hebrew to the Greek, the Scriptures of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint. Within this garden city of the ancient world, with its beautiful government buildings, broad streets, and fine parks, East and

West mingled in trade and commerce, giving and receiving their cultural contributions. The lighthouse of Pharos, guiding the sailors into the harbor, was a beacon of welcome to all who came to Alexandria to gaze upon its wonders, partake of its culture, or trade with its merchants.

Once again has Egypt become the home of culture, but this time it is not indigenous. East has mingled with West and West with East, so that we call the culture of this period—from the death of Alexander in 323 B.C to the final overthrow of Greece, the destruction of Corinth, and the ascendency of Roman power about 146 B.C.—the period of Hellenistic culture. Hellenism is pure Greek, but in Hellenistic culture we have Greek mixed with Orientalism. During this time we note a steady advance, not so much in the arts of warfare, as in the arts of peace. Homes are more comfortable, streets are wider, and the sanitary arrangements within the homes and throughout the cities are greatly in advance of those known in the finest period of Athenian history. In wild Macedonia, with its vulgar barbarism, as the Athenians thought, cities are rising, and the homes have conveniences such as baths and the like. Life was in many respects more humanized; and we of this day would have been infinitely more at home in it than we would have been in the Greek period. Many of the conveniences, discoveries, and inventions we mod-

erns think so much of, as administering to our physical comforts, were due in no small measure to the example set by the citizens of Alexandria. The Ptolemies in their entire line, particularly under Ptolemy II and Ptolemy III, raised Alexandria and Egypt to the very summit of fame, both political and cultural. The last ruler of this dynasty was the famous Cleopatra, beautiful as Helen of Troy, and past mistress in all the arts of feminine conquest, as Julius Cæsar was to realize when he succumbed to the rare charms of this girl, not yet out of her teens; for her radiant smile melted and enthralled his Roman heart.

VI

INDIA AND CHINA

When Alexander desired to become master of all Asia he must needs enter India to subject that great land to his will. His army succeeded in conquering the Punjab (the land of the five rivers), but beyond this his troops refused to move, and reluctantly Alexander returned to Persia. We doubt very much whether this visitation of Alexander had much influence upon India. Later on, Greek influences in astronomy, architecture, and sculpture did profoundly affect India. India, however, was destined to arouse an increasingly deeper interest in Europe. The Phenicians long since had contact with India for trading purposes, and Assyrian forces are supposed to have extended a partial conquest over it. India, however, still remained a land of mystery, for none of her early traders ever seem to have been anxious enough to go beyond her boundaries to trade, and none of her people migrated of their own accord. Trade relations of a sort had been going on with China for many years, making India a sort of middleman for Chinese silks, etc., between Europe and China. Unlike China, the roads of communication with the western world were never com-

pletely closed, even if they were never traveled on very much.

Quite apart from any other consideration, we are greatly interested in the history, life, and customs of India, because hers is the history of a great branch of the Aryan race. When we dig deep into it, we may bring up a lot of useless matter, as far as our main interest is concerned, but we also find a great deal that throws light upon the history of our common ancestors before they began that great trek which split up the family, taking some portions to Persia, some to the Ægean, and some to the West.

It is true of every civilization that its form and character are due in no small measure to the nature of the country that produces it. The climate and geography of the land set their indelible impress on all that is produced there. The main features of India's geography may be sketched in a few words. First of all, we have that mighty barrier, the Himalayas, the highest mountain range on earth, extending 1,750 miles from west to east, which by its height and protection makes possible the peculiar character of India's life and nature. Through the passes of this high range invaders from time to time entered the country on their conquering expeditions only to find in a few generations that the climate had completely conquered them. Through these passes, especially the Khaibar Pass, our ancient Aryan ancestors made their way, and

along the same roads have also passed Turks and various Mongolian peoples.

The triangle known as the Deccan is a broad tableland in the south. Then we have the river valleys of the Indus and the Ganges—great, fertile plains on the north and east of the country. As in Egypt, Babylonia, and China, so here we find cities with large populations, and farming areas of splendid fertility. The climate in these two valleys is sultry and enervating. The heat and moisture, together with the habits of the people, make the air foul with pestilential vapors, and these exact their toll.

A word must be said about the Vale of Kashmir. This beautiful mountain valley, bordered by snowfields, is, according to Indian tradition, the original site of the Garden of Eden, earth's paradise. The exceeding fertility of its soil, its glorious climate, the surpassing beauty of its mountain scenery, easily place it in the category of earth's choicest spots. Secluded, shut off from the world in a space all its own, having a width of from ten to forty miles and a length of sixty, situated 6,000 feet above sea level, with beautiful lakes, brilliant vegetation, and gigantic trees; in the daytime bathed in golden sunshine, and at night reflecting the shadows of the hills or serenely beautiful in the silver light of the moon —no wonder the poets love it as a theme!

Such a land as India was bound to attract peoples from other less favored areas, where the

struggle for existence allowed of no sluggards. So we find that in prehistoric times various peoples moved over into India to fight for some portion of its soil. The original inhabitants were forced to move up into the mountains, where some of their descendants still live, more or less in their original, simple condition. Some of these prehistoric inhabitants of India, even at the dawn of history, had advanced far enough to practise a crude agriculture and to build walled cities.

At some time or other before 2000 B.C. our Aryan ancestors moved through the Khaibar Pass down to the rich river valleys, and occupied territories along the Indus, and, later on, the plains on the Ganges. This was not done without many bitter struggles, notwithstanding the enervated condition of the peoples living there, as may be gathered from India's epics and legends. These legends and poems were collected by the ancient Brahman priests some time before 1400 B.C., and were called the Vedas. It is from the Vedas that we are able to gather so much information concerning the habits and customs of the Indian branch of the Aryan family, as well as some intimations concerning their life before they moved from their earliest recorded homeland in western Asia or possibly in Europe. These monuments of Indo-Aryan literature, while in many incidents presupposing historical knowledge not now in our posses-

sion, nevertheless give us a fine picture of early conditions in India as these Aryans found them. We know, for instance, that while the primitive inhabitants of India naturally lived on a low social scale, some of them were, as stated, advanced in civilization far enough to have walled cities, great herds, furniture, metal ornaments, etc., all of which, to the simple cattle-breeding Aryans, offered particularly desirable spoils.

In the oldest of these poems of the Aryans, the Rig-Veda, put together probably, like the Iliad of Homer, by various hands and at various times, we see not only the simplicity of early Aryan life, but also its higher stages of culture, with a complex development of religious life and practise. These, together with the many monuments remaining, are our only sources of information that is at all reliable, concerning early Aryan life there. The Rig-Veda has been aptly described as "the Bible of the Aryans of northwest India."

One of the most extraordinary features of Indian life is its caste system. This system is practised to no such extent by any other people, and is nowhere so deeply entrenched as in India. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that caste, in the fullest meaning of the term, is purely Indian. How did such a system arise? No certain knowledge can be advanced to supply an entirely satisfactory answer, but it is significant that its development and complexity advance

with the rise of the Brahmanic class. Its root idea is born in the early emphasis upon purity of stock, and so upon purity of descent. When the Aryans landed in India they were faced with the problem, not of subsistence, which was assured by the fertility of the country and by their conquest over the natives, but of the preservation of their race. The easiest thing in the world that could have happened to them would have been such a mixture with the native stock as to produce total assimilation within a few generations. This has happened on numberless occasions in the history of conquering peoples. We may be crediting these ancient Aryans with too much intelligence and foresight, and with too early an attachment to the Nordic superiority complex. Whether that be so or not, we are certain of the fact that barriers were raised against this stock-mixture, and that the purity of the Aryan strain was sought in the rearing of this amazing caste system. The Brahmanic or priestly class gained its supremacy over all other classes, including the noble, and developed the caste system to a very high state of efficiency. Our knowledge of its early development is too meager to admit of our treating it with any degree of finality, so we pass on to consider the characteristics of the four castes into which society was divided.

The highest class, the Brahmanic, was distinguished as the priestly class—those who knew

all the Vedas by heart, and alone practised the sacred rites. The noble or warrior class were called the Kshatriya, while those who engaged in the industry of agriculture were called the Vaiyas. These were the Aryan husbandmen; but all menial service, as well as handicraft work, was the lot of the subject race—the Sudras. This social structure stands unique in the history of the world. Credit for the caste system in its perfect form is given to the great law-maker, Manu, who is supposed to have codified its laws and regulations about 200 A.D. The entire structure is nothing other than a glorification of the priestly Brahmanic class, and a deliberate degradation of the lowest class. It aims to be a rigid, exclusive, thoroughly undemocratic, and unsocial thing. Every item of food, dress, habits, and customs was regulated, down to the minutest detail, with an absurdity characteristic of all priestly classes in their extreme form. In whatsoever order of society a man was born, in that class he was doomed or damned to remain to the end of his days. Such a system was bound to cripple every instinct of progress at its birth, and to stifle in its first expression almost every effort at reform, tho one great soul did break loose and preach a new gospel—Gautama Buddha.

We are indebted to the Brahmanic class for the greatest intellectual, literary, and philosophical productions coming out of India. In

their meditations upon the number of gods presented to them in the Vedas they arrived at the conclusion that the nature worship therein exhibited could no longer satisfy their intellectual requirements. Instead of a multiplicity of gods there was just one god-principle throughout the universe. This was a principle and not a person; hence theirs is not a religion in the accepted meaning of the term. This principle they called Brahma, and the followers or believers were called Brahmans.

Such a philosophical doctrine was too high for the common people to feel any warmth about, or to accept in any other way than as an undemonstrable proposition, interesting but inanimate. The old joy in nature worship, so characteristic of the ancient Aryans, had passed away in India. Politically, the country was ruled by a number of irresponsible despots, save in a few free Republics. It was in these that the reforming movement gained headway.

Gautama Buddha, the most famous of all the reformers, was born of royal parents, in the sixth century B.C. We know very little of his youth, but it doubtless followed the usual lines of his time in the enjoyment of social privileges. When he was nineteen years old he married his cousin, and, having fulfilled that duty, he gave himself up to the enjoyment of life. It is reported that he was ever a thoughtful boy, and that he had amply demonstrated his courage in

warfare. When he reached his thirtieth year an incident is supposed to have crystallized his thinking into a determination. He had begun to register in his mind that life was, in some of its phases, a horrible thing; and that rest and peace could only come to the human spirit through a complete mastery of life. Leaving his wife and family, and the luxuries of his station, he garbed himself in a monk's costume, and retired to a cave in order to reduce the chaos of his feelings to a cosmos of principles. Giving his body a black eye, as the Apostle Paul said he did, Gautama fasted and piled on bodily discomforts.

In due time the new way of life opened out before Gautama Buddha, and he went forth to teach and practise his new cure for the ills of soul and body. "Evil dispositions have ceased in me; therefore is it that I am conqueror," says the new evangelist. Then for a period of forty-five years, Gautama moves through the crowds in the valley of the Ganges, preaching his new evangel until he rests his aged bones in his last sleep under the famed fig-tree in the year 543 B.C. So passed one of the greatest religious forces the world has ever known, but after his passing others spread his evangel over large parts of the world's surface, converting millions to the way of life first revealed by the Great Enlightened One.

Buddha's doctrine may be summed up in his own words, which, tho not written by him, we

may accept as substantially true. He was sufficiently conversant with life to know that pain and sorrow were of the essence of life itself. These were the inevitable lot of all human beings. Wisdom dictates that a life of passion only accumulates the miseries.

"There is a middle path, a path which leads to peace, to insight, to higher wisdom, to Nirvana. Verily it is this noble eight-fold path; that is to say, Right Views, Right Aspirations, Right Speech, Right Conduct, Right Mode of Living, Right Effort, Right-Mindedness, and Right Rapture."

There was to be no torture of the body as a means of discipline. Self-control, sympathy, service, and a true reverence for all living things were the main elements. Sacrifices to the gods were useless, nobility of life was everything. Buddha stretched forth his hand to the Sudras and the outcasts; and if his moral precepts had established themselves over India the story of that sad country would have been entirely otherwise than it has been. No man, said Buddha, can reach any higher state than that of perfect rest, perfect peace, entire unconsciousness, where the will does not operate, and where the mind does not disturb—Nirvana—the state of the blessed. To this blessedness all were invited.

Shortly after his death, Buddha's ideas and his gospel suffered the corruptive influences inevitable in that time. The ignorant could not be

taken from their gods, for the doctrine was too lofty for these people living on the enervating plains of the Ganges. Its influence, however, notwithstanding its corrupted forms, has been profound and far reaching, especially in China and elsewhere outside the country that saw its birth. In 65 A.D. one of the Chinese emperors sent messengers to India in order to obtain authoritative information concerning the Buddhist faith. Priests returned with these messengers and established the religion in the capital. From China the religious faith of Buddha, corrupted tho it was, went into Korea and Japan, and won to its banners the Mongolian tribes of Inner Asia. So these two peoples, Mongolian and Aryan, were joined together by the hands of Buddha, and the union was to have far-reaching consequences.

China

The world of the Hellenistic peoples knew little of that secluded world called China; and even to-day many people think of it as of some colossal kindergarten system for the production of laundrymen. No other country with so rich a genius has ever been so little known and consequently so little appreciated as China. Long before Hammurabi had codified the laws of his country; centuries before the voice of Socrates was heard in the market place of Athens; before Romulus ever looked about him for a site on

which to build the mighty city of Rome, the Chinese had produced their greatest literature, and had reared themselves by their own genius to an exceedingly high standard of civilization. But China was off the beaten track, infinitely more isolated then India, and also greatly in advance of her. Whether the great river valley civilizations of the Nile, the Indus, the Ganges, and the Yangtze-Kiang had any great communication the one with the other in ancient times is uncertain. The probability is that communication of some sort did go on, but definite assurance of it still escapes us. In the north of China lies the territory known as Mongolia. This was the home-land of the original Mongolian nomadic tribes, a territory about half the size of the United States, with an elevation of 2,000 to 8,000 feet. Here the tribes found ample pasturage for their flocks and herds.

The Chinese proper are the only ones of these early Mongolian peoples who moved out of their primitive conditions to a higher stage of civilization. This civilization was peculiarly their own, stamped with their individuality, and expressing their genius.

The early history of the Chinese, like the early history of all other peoples, is lost in the mists of antiquity or buried in a mass of myth and legend. As early Hindu chronology is fantastically imaginative, and so not to be relied on in any particular, so also the early Chinese

chronology suffered from a similar exaggeration. The Chinese look upon the year 2852 B.C. as the date marking the first great historical event, the beginning of the emperorship of Fu-hi. Whether we are to trust the records of later Chinese historians dealing with the centuries succeeding this, will have to be settled by the scholars in that department; for, while one section would accept the *Book of History,* edited by Confucius, as entirely authentic, another section refuses to accept these data, and seriously questions the book's editorship by the illustrious hand of Confucius. We may be fairly safe in asserting that previous to 2200 B.C. we are in a mythical or semi-mythical period. About this date China was a typical feudal state with a fairly well organized government. The people were engaged in agriculture, silk culture, and mining; which indicates that there must have been a long period of quiet development back of this epoch.

The feudal system was raised to its most perfect form by Wu-wang, the founder of the famous Chow dynasty (B.C. 1122-249). Wu-wang was a man of uncommon ability, and was animated by a real concern for the welfare of his people. It was during his reign that the emperor rewarded those assisting him in the problems of consolidating the empire, by granting them fiefs, large territories over which they ruled, subject only to their emperor. The title given to the

emperor, "Son of Heaven," carried in it a sacred significance; he was the great high priest, ruling by the will of heaven, and under its guidance and protection; consequently, the person of the emperor was sacrosanct, and was not to be approached save by the observance of ceremonies of the most exacting kind. The natural disposition of the Chinese character soon crystallized these ceremonies into adamant, not to be violated or broken under any consideration. But Wu-wang is famous in Chinese history not alone for these reforms, but also for his organization of schools throughout his domains, infirmaries for the aged, and many other beneficial institutions.

Unfortunately, Wu-wang was not able to impress his wisdom upon his successors, and these were not able to learn from the experience of the past. Thus, as in medieval Germany, we see the undermining of the imperial authority, and civil war breaks out with all its evils. By the seventh century B.C. the authority of the emperor was as nominal as the authority of the kings in the heyday of feudalism in Europe. Such a condition called to heaven for reform, inasmuch as the Son of Heaven had fallen from his high estate. More often than not, emergencies in society and state are opportunities for the disclosure of real greatness. Fires and persecutions, wars and crises do not make great men, they simply reveal them; and so it was with China.

In 551 B.C., Confucius saw the light of day in the feudal state of Fu, in the province of Shantung. By this time, notwithstanding feudal conditions, Chinese culture had definitely revealed its character, and China enjoyed a relatively high state of civilization. But its religious life had fallen into decay during the turbulent years of the later emperors. The old happy life of Chinese faith had passed away, and people were drifting into degenerate habits and customs. The probability is that the early life of Confucius was one of respectable poverty, in which living was low but thinking was assuredly not so. At any rate, we find the great teacher affirming that when he was fifteen his mind was set on learning, and at thirty he stood firm in his convictions. He started out in the determination to restore the old institutions that had fallen upon evil days, and to bring back the people to their former allegiance to the ancient laws, starting out with the assumption that mankind is at heart naturally good. He would have expressed impatience with the theory that the heart was essentially bad, full of deceit, and wicked above all things. Give men an example of goodness, reveal it to them in your deeds, and they will rise to do likewise. Give the people an understanding of the meaning of virtue and right living, and the rest can safely be entrusted to them. These were no new-fangled ideas that he taught; there was no effort to introduce moral

or practical innovations. "My teaching," he said, "is that which our forefathers taught and handed down to us; I have added nothing and taken away nothing; I teach it in its original purity; it is unchangeable as the heaven itself from which it comes. I but scatter, like the tiller of the soil, the seed which I have received, unchanged, upon the earth."

Confucius received from the Duke of Fu the privilege of trying out his theories for a period of three months, first as governor of a town, then as governor of the whole of Fu. A commentary on his government runs as follows: "Dishonesty and dissoluteness were ashamed and held their heads. Loyalty and good faith became the characteristics of men, and chastity and docility those of the women." We learn that the good work was stopped in its further progress by the action of a neighboring ruler, who had grown darkly jealous of what was being done within his friend's kingdom. So he put a stop to it by the ingenious device of sending beautiful courtesans and fine horses to the Duke of Fu, who so deeply appreciated the gift and the interest of his brother ruler that he informed Confucius that his counsel and guidance were no longer needed. Confucius then became a peripatetic teacher in true Eastern style, wandering about from state to state preaching his doctrines, followed by his band of disciples. These disciples flocked about him, and unlike those of his

brother philosopher in Athens, Socrates, heaped honors upon him.

Many of the teachings of Confucius have come down to us, entering into the stream of our life without our recognizing their origin. He anticipated the words of Christ, tho put in negative form: "Do not do to others what you would not have them do to you"; also: "Do Justice to thy neighbor." When a ruler asked whether he ought not to cut off the lawless and thereby establish law and order, he replied: "Sir, what need is there of the death penalty in your system of government? If you showed a sincere desire to be good, your people would likewise be good. The virtue of the prince is like unto wind; that of the people like unto grass. For it is the nature of grass to bend when the wind blows upon it." A few more quotations of his pithy sayings: "The higher type of man makes a sense of duty the groundwork of his character, blends with it in action a sense of harmonious proportion, manifests it in a sense of unselfishness, and perfects it by the addition of sincerity and truth. Then indeed is he a noble character."

Concerning himself: "At fifteen, my mind was bent on learning. At thirty I stood firm. At forty I was free from delusions. At fifty I understood the laws of Providence. At sixty my ears were attentive to the truth. At seventy I could follow the promptings of my heart without overstepping the mean. The failure to cultivate virtue,

the failure to examine and analyze what I have learnt, the inability to move toward righteousness after being shown the way, the inability to correct my faults, these are the causes of my grief."

"I do not expound my teaching to any who are not anxious to learn; I do not help out anyone who is not anxious to explain himself; if, after being shown one corner of the subject, a man cannot go on to discover the other three, I do not repeat the lesson."

And a last one, which shows how unmodern he was: "If the pursuit of riches were a commendable pursuit, I would join in it, even if I had to become a chariot-driver for the purpose. But seeing that it is not a commendable pursuit, I engage in those which are more to my taste."

Confucius died in 479 B.C. His teachings can hardly be described as forming part of a religious system, for the emphasis is laid on ethics, propriety, reverence for tradition, and filial piety. But no people have been so thoroughly moulded by any teachings as have the Chinese by these practical doctrines of Confucius. During these last two thousand years they have entered into the warp and woof of the Chinese character; and most of the excellent qualities of the Chinese are without doubt due to the permeative and determinative influence of this unique man. To the repressive influence of his teachings, no doubt,

is due the static condition of Chinese society; and much of China's inability to adjust itself to the demands of the modern world as expressed in western civilization is due in no small measure to the strait-jacket ethics of Confucius. The most renowned follower of Confucius was his great disciple Mencius.

At the close of the nine centuries comprising the Chow dynasty we see the disruption of the feudal system, and the beginning of a movement headed by Shih-Hwang-ti, later called Chung, for a reunion of all the states into a single nation. This great statesman used every instrument at hand to realize his aim. He gained the cooperation of the ablest men in the country; directed them and his affairs with an iron will, and stooped even to savagery in his desire to push aside opposition. All that the past had borne over to the present must be destroyed. All fiefs were abolished, and the entire kingdom divided into thirty-six provinces, each ruled by three officials answerable to him for their government. This suggests a close approximation to the kind of rule set up by the Persian, Darius, which seemed to have power in itself to govern by momentum when all ability had passed from the rulers. A similar condition prevailed in China, for until recent times the system established by Chung (Hwang-ti) remained in its essential aspects the government of China.

Naturally, such reforms as Chung introduced

must needs come into conflict with the interests of those who stood for the *status quo,* and particularly the *status quo ante.* The old conservative literati must have greatly incensed Chung by their continual quotations from the classics, thrown like darts from a quarter where each man had his quiver full. In order to stop this harking back to the past, Chung ordered that all classical books, particularly those of Confucius, should be burned. A man of his will-power, of demonstrated ability in the execution of his will, saw to it that the order was carried out to the last letter. It was; but the books had been written indelibly on the memories of scholars, so the object was only partially effected. Chung's memory has been held in execration by succeeding Chinese scholars; but his great achievements in founding united China can never be denied. His successors were not made of his stuff, and the empire again fell into disorder, to be restored to order by Kau Ti, the founder of the Han Dynasty. China now goes forward to extend her territories, so we see her armies marching to the west and to the south.

Before Chung had passed away, the barbarian Huns, who were to come like a scourge and a pestilence over Europe, had begun their incursions over Chinese territory. Some of the northern princes had begun the erection of the Great Wall in order to keep the Huns back; Chung cooperated in the work, so that the Great Wall

stood as the largest fortification the world was ever to see, extending over a distance approximately 2,000 miles. The rulers of the Han Dynasty, however, did not intend to await the coming of the Huns. They took their armies and invaded Central Asia, where their victories extended their boundaries to the Caspian Sea. The Chinese colonists settled along the northwestern boundaries and were effective in keeping that region safe from further incursions. The two Han Dynasties lasted from 206 B.C. to 221 A.D., the latter period being one of general prosperity and intense intellectual activity.

For four centuries after the close of this dynasty China was to pass through some of her bitterest experiences. Dissensions, civil wars, jealousies, and incapacity in high places, were all to make China the easy prey of invaders from without. The Huns tore through the walls of fortification, spoiled the lands, and cut out, in the northern part of China, a kingdom of their own, called Wei. This kingdom lasted from 386 to 534 A.D. Then came the glorious T'ang Dynasty (618-908 A.D.), a period of unsurpassed prosperity and general enlightenment. While Europe, as we shall see, was steeped in ignorance, and the night of the Dark Ages was upon it, China was undoubtedly the most civilized and prosperous country on earth. During the two hundred and eighty-seven years of this dynasty laws were above men, and the government was

managed by emperors and officials who looked upon public office as a public trust.

It was during these humane times that Ts'en-Ts'an wrote:

Night is at hand; the night-winds fret afar,
The north winds moan. The water-fowl are gone
To cover o'er the sand dunes; dawn alone
Shall call them from the sedges. Some bright star

Mirrors her charms upon the silver shoal;
And I have ta'en the lute, my only friend;
The vibrant chords beneath my fingers blend;
They sob awhile, then as they slip control

Immortal memories awake, and the dead years
Through deathless voices answer to my strings,
Till from the brink of time's untarnished springs
The melting night recalls me with her tears.

Not only was there no voice in Europe that could sing such a melody at this time, but it is doubtful if there was one who could appreciate it. The singing time of Europe was yet to be, while China still sang on.

VII

THE ROMAN EMPIRE

When we think of Greece, we see Athens; when we think of Hellenistic culture, we see Alexandria; when we think of Roman law and government, there rises "the grandeur that was Rome." The empire of Greece, which was that of the intellect, of art, of philosophy and of literature, of the love of the beautiful and of freedom, had its home in the small city-state of Athens. The mighty empire of law and of government, of things greatly practical—whose influence is not exhausted at the present hour—had its first home in the city-state of Rome on the banks of the Tiber.

When the glory of Greece was at its height, a number of tribes of the Aryan race were dwelling in parts of the peninsula of Italy. Some of these were destined in time to extend their sway from their home city of Rome, throughout Italy, the eastern Mediterranean, and the western world. The story of the rise and development of the Romans is as thrilling as that of the rise of any great political and civilizing power.

As with the beginnings of other ancient nations, so with that of Rome; it is not possible for us to trace with certainty the ways by which Italy was settled, or the number of tribes making

up the Italic race. The tradition as to the founding of Rome itself, partly fact but mostly fable, is the famous story of Romulus and Remus. On the destruction of Troy, Æneas fled to Italy, where he was fortunate enough to marry Lavinia, daughter of King Latinus. Ascanius, the son of Æneas, not being satisfied with the site which his father had built his city upon, took his people with him to a high mountain, where he hewed out a place for his city. The site being long and narrow, the city built thereon was called Alba Longa—the long white city. Now the last king of Alba Longa was named Procus, and he left two sons, Numitor the elder, and Amulius the younger. The father dying, Amulius seized the kingdom, giving his brother but a small share of his father's private inheritance, and compelling his niece, Rhea Silvia, to take her place among the Sacred Virgins. But the god Mars fell in love with the young lady; and to the chagrin of Amulius, she gave birth to twins, Romulus and Remus.

Not to be outwitted, Amulius ordered the two children to be cast into the river. So, placed in a basket, they are cast adrift. But the river was in flood, and the basket was carried along until it got upset at the Palatine Hill—but on to the land. Just at this moment a thirsty she-wolf happened to come down to the river to take a drink, and, being moved by an impulse of pity, she carried the two children to her cave, where

she suckled them, assisted by a wood-pecker who brought them food in her kindly beak. Here they were found by a herdsman, who, also moved by pity, took them to his good wife Larentia, and she brought them up with her children. When they grew up, having learned all about their cruel uncle, they set forth to execute vengeance upon him. Then, having killed him, they placed their grandfather on the throne of Alba Longa, while upon the Palatine Hill, on the left bank of the Tiber, they built the city which they called Rome.

But before the walls of the city had been completed Remus was killed, owing to a bitter dispute between the brothers. The killing was done not by the hand of Romulus, but by the spade of Celer, the overseer of the work, for Remus had tried to stop the enterprise from going forward, strenuously objecting to that particular site. Romulus was left to rule his city alone; and he ruled it justly, wisely, and well, so that his people greatly loved him. Forty years after he had begun to rule, Mars, his father, caught him up in a tempest and carried him aloft to heaven. In the darkness of night Romulus appeared to one Proculus Julius and said to him: "Go, and tell my people that they weep not for me any more; but bid them to be brave and warlike, and so shall they make my city the greatest in the earth."

The city that Romulus founded attracted large

numbers of men, but few women; consequently it would not last longer than one generation unless something could be done about it. The city had been thrown open to everybody, vagabonds and villains alike, and mothers were not anxious to marry their daughters off to such as they. But ingenuity came to the aid of this city of bachelors—the Sabines were invited to partake in celebrations in honor of Neptunus Equestris. The magnificence of the celebrations drew large crowds of curious matrons and virgins, many of them surpassingly beautiful, and as many, otherwise. When the cue was given, the Roman youths ran this way and that, seizing the virgins, and running off with them to their homes. The parents of these young women retired in grief and humiliation. Matters could not end there, of course, and war followed. The two armies faced each other, and were about to fight to the last man, when the young wives rushed out and put an end to the matter. If they had not learned to love their bold husbands, they were at least not disinclined to enjoy the pleasures of their new homes. A compromise resulted, and the dual kingdom was ruled by Romulus and the Sabine king Tatius.

Romulus is supposed to have instituted the Senate, and to have divided the people into thirty curiæ. The various elements in the population were composed of full citizens or patricians; half citizens or plebeians; and clients.

At the death of Romulus it was agreed that the next king should be a Sabine, and Numa Pompilius was selected because of his justice, wisdom, and piety. He was the first of the seven kings who are supposed to have ruled during this mythical period. The last was the Etruscan king, Tarquinius Superbus, and he and the two preceding Etruscan kings are supposed to have beautified Rome with many fine buildings. The first of the three, Tarquinius Priscus, laid the foundations of the famous Capitol on the Capitoline Hill, and constructed the great sewer (cloaca maxima) by means of which the marshy grounds amidst the hills were drained; he constructed also the Circus Maximus, and the Forum. The last of the Etruscan line was a bloodthirsty tyrant, so that the long-suffering Romans decided they could tolerate kings no longer, and monarchy came to a fitting end. At the close of this period the people were divided into five classes according to their property holdings. The poorest classes were called the proletarians.

With the passing of the kings, power in the state passed to two consuls, elected by vote to serve for one year. On critical occasions, such as the outbreak of war, the power of the consuls was superseded by that of a dictator, to whom was given absolute power for a period of six months.

Matters, however, did not go any too well with the young republic. The Etruscans, incited by

the expelled Tarquinius, made war against Rome, and would have captured the city but for the bravery of Horatius, who kept back the Etruscan hosts while fighting courageously at the bridge which crossed the Tiber.

Within the republic the common people were in a sorry plight. All the advantages of public office were in the hands of the patricians, and, as so often happens, power enjoyed over too long a time had come to be exercised arbitrarily, without regard to justice or the well-being of the state. The Roman patricians had grown jealous of their rights, tenacious in their grip upon political power, stupidly selfish, and blindly greedy. So once again, as it so often happens in history, the two classes, patrician and plebeian—the "have gots" and the "have nots," stood arrayed one against the other. The patricians laid claim not only to the plums of political office, but also to the sole right of communicating with the gods. And they stood like adamant against the intermingling of plebeian with patrician blood.

The common people had seen their land devastated, their belongings plundered, heaping burdens laid upon them, during the successive calls to battle for glory and their fatherland. Their debts piled up to heaven, and the interest charges almost reached the same heights. When the loan rate was lowered to 10 per cent., the change was welcomed as a relief. Creditors be-

came the only lenders, and plebeian Rome became economically dependent upon patrician Rome. How long, O Lord, how long? The situation became intolerable. Rome owned large tracts of public lands, but the only class permitted to use them was the patrician. Is it to be wondered at that these plebeians did not love their patrician masters, or that many of them were willing to die for "that common fatherland of all great souls—pure liberty"?

This condition of affairs within the city provoked the plebeians to rise en masse, not to overthrow the existing rule, but to found a city for themselves. The patricians were greatly concerned. When 18,000 of these commoners marched beyond the walls of the city the patricians were dismayed. Where were they going to get the necessary soldiers to fight the neighboring tribes, who were anything but neighborly? Compromises must be proposed, concessions must be made. Back come the plebeians—they have won some of their points; old debts are canceled; the debtors sold into slavery are released. A new institution is erected, destined to play an important part in Rome's future history—the system of tribunes, representatives of the people, who have power to defend the interests of the commoners. The tribunes can appeal from the decision of any Roman magistrate, and can render null and void any decision of the consuls. They can even punish a disobedient

magistrate, while no one could touch their persons, for the patricians have vowed before the gods that anyone who touches or insults a tribune is to be outlawed from Rome.

That little march out of the city won the commoners a great deal. But the patricians could not take it all lying down. They bided their time to wring some of the power out of the hands of the tribunes. The day arrived, when starvation threatened the commoners through a failure of the crops. Famine stared them in the face; the poor were famishing. Large quantities of grain were on the way from Syracuse; so Marcius Coriolanus suggested that none of it should be distributed until the people had dismissed their tribunes. By a sudden turn, however, he himself made a hurried flight from the city, and, joining the Volscians, led an army against Rome. Here the mothers of Rome intervened, led by the mother of Coriolanus and his wife; together the two women prevailed upon him to put up his arms. "Mother," he exclaimed, "you have saved Rome, but lost your son." He knew the fierce appetites of his Volscians; his blood alone could satisfy them.

Meanwhile Rome's enemies roundabout were busy. At Mount Ægidus the entire Roman army would have been destroyed, had it not been for the leadership of the famous farmer-general, Cincinnatus. The Senate called him, and he left

the plow in its furrow to go and lead the Roman youth to victory.

The plebeians had become class-conscious in the realization of their needs, and of their united strength to satisfy them. Too often, as with their plebeian fellow Greeks in earlier days, had they been made to feel the arbitrary judgments of the magistrates against their interests, and against justice itself. They had fought for decent agrarian laws, for some legislative representation, and had won both; now they must win the right to have the laws by which they are going to be judged, published, so that all may read and understand them.

Their demand is heeded. Three men are entrusted with a mission to go to Athens and other Greek cities to study the laws and constitutions of Solon, *et al.* They report their findings, and ten men—the Decemvirs—are commissioned to draw up a new code of laws. While in office they supersede the consuls and the tribunes, and are given supreme powers over the state. In the second year, power unwisely used, and passions undisciplined, cause their expulsion from the city before the wild rage of the people. Back comes the old system of government, but the twelve tables of laws, engraved on twelve tables of brass fixed to the Rostra of the Forum, stand witness to the people's gains. They continue to struggle for equal rights and equal privileges until they win the right to break down the wall

of partition which has hitherto made it impossible for plebeian blood to mix with patrician.

While these struggles were going on within the Republic for plebeian rights, the army was busy fighting the neighboring tribes. The paid standing army of the Romans was proving its efficiency, and success followed success with almost monotonous regularity. For ten years it had maintained a siege of the town of Venii, and a large number of Etruscan cities had fallen before it.

Other forces were gathering like a cloud to the north of them. The Gauls had crossed the Alps, settling down in Italy. When they besieged Clusium in Etruria, that city cried aloud to Rome for help. In the war that ensued, the Roman army was crushed. The citizens began to flee from Rome, and confusion reigned. Burning and ravaging the towns on their way down, the Gauls at last encamped about the capital city. Within, a small garrison held out for seven long months, but the issue seemed certain. One dark night the Gauls managed to scale the walls while the garrison slept; but the geese sacred to Juno, disturbed in their slumbers, set up a loud cackling. Thus the Romans were aroused and the city was saved. Gold satisfied the diminished demands of the Gauls, and they retreated. Old Rome was in ruins, but a new Rome soon rose resplendent above the ruins.

From 300 to 200 B.C. the Romans were busy

extending their conquests over the peninsula. One of the toughest problems was to conquer the Samnites, a rude hill-folk dwelling along the ridges of the Apennines. It required more than seventy years, and three great wars, before these hardy Samnites gave way to Roman power. The conquest of lower Italy was relatively easy, save for a surprizing resistance encountered at the rich city of Tarentum. Here the people had called upon Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, to come to their aid. He was one of the most famous generals and warriors of his time. By his use of a large number of elephants he won two victories of note, and some of less consequence. But he lost so many men that he is reported to have said, "Another such victory, and I shall return alone." Ever since then we have had the phrase, "a Pyrrhic victory." The Roman machine rolled on, for it seemed conscious of the fact that tho it might be stopped in its progress occasionally, nothing could hinder its ultimate arrival at the goal of its peculiar destiny.

Much of Rome's success against her enemies was doubtless due to the fact that her chief wars were fought, one at a time. It is interesting to speculate as to what might have happened to Rome's ambitions and to the history of the world if Alexander the Great had not died when the Romans were engaged in their Samnite wars, but had lived to move his mighty Macedonian forces toward the west. Rome just managed to beat her

enemies one by one; but had she been matched by more powerful forces, led by greater men, history would have had a different story to tell.

The most dangerous rival she was called upon to meet was the Carthaginian power lying across the path she must needs tread if she was to fulfil her destiny. The Phenicians had settled at Carthage in the north of Africa, had established trading posts and factories all around the Mediterranean, and had taken up a strong position in Sicily. Carthage had long been a city of great wealth and power, and had established many prosperous colonies, which she was prepared to hold at whatever sacrifice. Mistress of the sea, she must match that power against Rome, master on land. Again we see East facing West—Semitic civilization about to throw down the gantlet to Aryan civilization—and the war which was to drag its weary length through many years was to decide the issue in a ruthless fashion. The war itself may be conveniently divided up into three periods: From 264 to 257 B.C. we see the Romans, in a series of victories, driving the Carthaginians into the southern and western corners of Sicily. The second period, from 256 to 250, finds success alternating with failure. The third is a long and tiresome period of nine years—249-240—during which the Romans consolidate their gains, recuperate their armies, and finally destroy the menace of the Carthaginians in a great battle on the sea.

The Punic war, as this series of conflicts is called, had revealed the striking qualities of two great generals: Scipio, who commanded the Roman army in Spain, and later crossed over to Africa, where he fought the Carthaginians and won a famous victory at Tama, which concluded the war; and Hannibal, mighty leader of the Carthaginian armies. Hannibal had accomplished feats which would have taxed to the utmost the resources of the greatest generals of all time. Scipio returned to Rome in triumph, and honors were heaped upon him, while Hannibal, after counseling the Carthaginian Senate to accept the terms of the enemy because of the distress of his country, passed out of the picture to end his days in exile.

To use a current expression, Carthage was down but not out. Her vitality was not completely exhausted, for she gradually regained her former position and much of her wealth. But she made the mistake of violating the treaty with Rome, and engaged in a war of her own without asking the consent of her mighty overlord. Roman eyes had noted the reviving power of Carthage, and the impassioned voice of Cato was heard to conclude his every speech with the words "Ceterum censeo Carthagineam esse delendam." Yes; Carthage must be destroyed, and Rome was not satisfied until the great African city was leveled to the dust. The exasperated Carthaginians renewed their vigor as

they saw the destruction going forward. Time after time they repulsed the Roman legions, only to be subdued at last by Scipio the younger. Those who were not massacred were sold into slavery, and the entire Carthaginian territory was added to the growing list of Roman provinces.

The war against Greece added still more territory, and the "Eye of Greece," the prosperous city of Corinth, was taken and destroyed while the destruction of Carthage was going on. The expedition into Macedonia completely conquered that country, and the Macedonian monarchy was annihilated. In Spain, the Roman army was forced to suppress revolts of warlike tribes such as the Celtiberians and the Lustanians. Rome's rule now extended over Spain, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Macedonia, northern Africa, western Asia, and Gallia Narbonensis; the Mediterranean sea was a Roman lake, and the end was not yet.

In the meantime all was not well with Rome herself. She had conquered Asia, but was liable to be conquered by the corruptive luxuries flowing into the capital from the East. Great wealth had been taken to Rome from the provinces. Luxury and immorality abounded among the officials and military leaders. Laws could not stay the tide—the flood was too high and its spread too wide. The people gloried in the victories of their armies—and dipped their hands into the flesh-pots, losing their old-time vigor,

and giving themselves up to idleness and enervating pleasures. Adventurers flocked to Rome to exploit their talents and to insinuate their vices. Religion, with all its ceremonies, was scoffed at, save exotic religious ceremonies introduced from the East. Cults of all kinds sprang up and flourished. The time when Rome thought of marriage as "the union of two lives, the blending of two inheritances, a common interest in everything religious and temporal," had long departed. These were new days with new privileges. The canker of corruption, of degeneracy, of a wanton disregard of the virtues that had given Rome her strength to become mistress of the civilized world, was eating its way slowly to her heart.

Will some man rise like a rock within a weary land to stop this human drift? A man rises in the person of Cato, who champions the former things of Rome's greatness—the old religion, the simple habits, the early moral standards—all those elemental virtues of the days when men lived on high and noble levels. He keeps vigilant watch and cries with a clarion voice: "You have heard me repeat that two contrary vices undermine the Republic, luxury and avarice. They are the scourges which have ruined every big empire." Noble words; but Cato feels the grip of avarice himself; he stretches out both hands for more and more wealth. The day comes when, perhaps as a salve to his conscience, he writes

his apologia: "The admirable man, the divine man, the man most worthy of glory, is he who can show by his accounts that he has acquired more wealth than he received from his fathers." So the man who is to stop the drift is not Cato, after all; he is too infirm with the infirmities of his people.

On December 10, 134 B.C., young Gracchus entered upon his office as tribune of the people. His eloquent speeches had presented a picture of the striking contrast between the Italy of his own day and the Italy of other days, when the yeomen and the small-holdings farmers were the backbone of the country. He introduced a bill, by means of which he hoped to restore the small-holdings farmers; to take away the lands stolen by the rich, and to distribute them among the poor. He touched avarice to the quick; but his scheme was shattered, because it was too bold, too comprehensive, too direct a challenge of vested interests. In the end the politicians massacred him and three hundred of his followers.

Caius, his brother, wrapped the mantle of the reformer about himself, becoming still more daring, throwing moderation to the winds. His popularity made him the master of the Republic —but not for long. He also fell, and three thousand of his followers with him.

Men sigh for peace: public spirit seems to have died, and only the strong hand of a dic-

tator can match the hour. Aristocracy has again triumphed, tho the struggle between rich and the poor still goes on. It is a period of universal corruption and decay—and of lack of capable leaders. Africa reveals the degradation into which the oligarchy has fallen. Jugurtha, king of Numidia, takes possession of several provinces by assassinating the rulers. Rome's investigators disgust even Jugurtha by their willingness to sell themselves to him for acceptable sums. A new leader arises from the common people—Marius, son of a peasant, an energetic soldier, but coarse, unscrupulous, ambitious. In a single campaign he has conquered Jugurtha and delivered him to Sulla, to be led in chains through the streets of Rome (105 B.C.). More work awaits him in checking the invasions of the barbarian Teutons and Cimbri, who threaten Italy itself after ravaging Gaul. The barbarians have destroyed four Roman armies; but now they make the mistake of dividing their forces, so that when Marius meets the Teutons at Aix he completely annihilates them. He meets the Cimbri at Vercellæ and repeats his success. It is estimated that 120,000 barbarians are killed—thousands taken prisoner and sold into slavery. Rome is jubilant. Marius is deluged with honors, but his vanity shows above them all—the vanity by which at last he fell. Meanwhile, the savior of Italy is the idol of the democratic party.

A new danger arises in Italy, called the Social

War. Denied hitherto the full privileges of Roman citizenship, Rome's allies within Italy now rise to demand them. Samnites and Marsians, renouncing allegiance to Rome, establish a rival state with Corfinium as their capital. To prevent further disruption the Senate capitulates, and ultimately all the allies in Italy are accorded the full privileges of Roman citizenship.

During this social war there emerges Sulla, the great rival of Marius, who is destined, in his championing of the cause of the Senate and of the nobles, to bring to a climax their conflicting ambitions. Sulla had been sent to the East to fight Mithridates. While he was away, Marius, by his mob appeal, had a decree passed transferring the command of the army to himself. Sulla's army refused to accept the command of Marius, murdered the officers who brought the order, and marched on Rome. Marius and his party must needs flee into exile, where he passes through many vicissitudes—only to return in good time.

Sulla was now all-powerful, with a tremendous capacity for revenge. For three years he enjoyed the rule of an Asiatic despot—then suddenly retired. One act of his, however, was filled with portentous significance—he had led his army into Rome, and by its means raised himself to political power. The army had entered the political arena, never more to leave it. Before leaving office, Sulla had remodeled the constitution. The

Assembly was deprived of its legislative powers: the Senate was doubled in size, and to it was given the control of the law courts. How long were the changes to last?

This was the condition of affairs when Julius Cæsar entered the political arena. Never was any man confronted with greater problems—those having to do with the constitution, with social and economic affairs, with the corruptions of wealth, and with the government of the empire. Opinions differ concerning this man, but there can be no doubt that he showed marvelous ability in dealing with difficulties of the state. He was probably the first to see that Old Rome had passed away, that Republican Rome was passing, and that the Rome that was to be must be controlled and guided by a strong hand—the hand of a dictator whose heart and hand were devoted to the state, animated by unceasing energy, and directed by a clearly defined policy.

It would take us too far afield to enter into the details of this stirring time. But after the battle of Actium—where Octavian led the Roman army against Cleopatra, whom he was to chastise by order of the Senate—he returned to Rome, and there the Senate heaped honors upon him, and absolute power. The title, "Augustus," was conferred upon him—a title which had hitherto been applied only to the gods. By this title, Augustus Cæsar, history knows him.

The strong man had at last appeared. Augus-

tus knew that his power rested upon his soldiers, so he made the army a permanent organization and distributed his soldiers over the Empire so as to keep back the barbarians and preserve himself from attacks at home.

The Republic has passed away—the Roman Empire stands in its place. The days of conquest and expansion are over; these are to be days of consolidation, of law, and of government. Augustus rules in peace; his is a tyranny in the best sense of that word. He gives his assistance and encouragement to the arts and sciences. He boasts of the fact that he took over a Rome of bricks, but leaves it a city of marble. With Augustus there comes a revival of literature, an opening up of the well-springs of Roman genius. For fifty years he holds the world under his sway, and is more firmly entrenched at his death than at any earlier time. When he accepted the title of Princeps, Rome was inchoate, almost falling apart; he leaves it an empire without a peer. No great emotion seems to move him; he pursues the even tenor of his ways with calm and deliberate judgment, and with fine moderation. By the touch-stone of results, he well deserves the title of "great." Master of himself, he mastered a world, and left to posterity an unchallenged position as "the most consummate master of practical politics."

While great Augustus rules his mighty Empire, there is born in the little town of Bethle-

hem—an insignificant part of the Empire—one whose sway is destined to be over the hearts and minds of men—Jesus, the founder of an empire of the spirit which knows no boundaries of color or of race, and which has gone on from strength to strength, until it bids fair to encompass the globe. The simple record of his life—the pervasiveness of his spirit—the gentleness of his methods, have, notwithstanding the clash of creeds and the declamations of blind dogmatists, won more hearts and claimed a deeper allegiance than any empire reared upon a foundation steeped in human blood. At the age of thirty he moved out of the limits of his Nazareth home, to begin a public ministry, which but partially affected the life of Palestine, but which, during the two centuries after his death, was to transform the face of civilization. His ardent followers were to carry his gospel through the Greek world—to Rome and to the Eastern nations—establishing their churches, practising their benevolences, comforting the poor, dignifying labor, and holding forth the hope of immortality to all.

During the first century of our era Rome was to know and to suffer from the base tyranny of such despots as Caligula and Nero. Vespasian and Titus were emperors of the better type. During the reign of the five good emperors—Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius—the quality of the rulers is

sufficiently indicated by the adjective applied to their reigns. Tho Marcus Aurelius was engaged in a desperate struggle with the German barbarians, nevertheless, his reign was one of the happiest periods in Roman history. Commodus was the son of the good Aurelius, but he followed not in the ways of his father; with him the reign of evil begins its sad story again. "Farewell to goodness, farewell to reason! Now, all hail, folly! All hail, absurdity! All hail to the Syrian and his questionable gods! Genuine physicians have been able to do nothing; the sick man is more sick than ever: send for the charlatans."

After the close of the second century the Roman Empire goes rapidly to decay. The German tribes come over the Rhine and into North Italy; the Goths cross the Danube; the Persians invade Syria and capture the emperor, Valerian. Rome was heading toward ruin, but was temporarily halted by a great statesman, Diocletian, who instituted a new form of government in order to hold the empire together. Then followed the worthy Constantine, who was destined to play so great a rôle on the stage of history; but with him we come to a definite parting of the ways, for he established his capital, not at Rome, but on the strategic site of old Byzantium, rebuilding the city and renaming it Constantinople. That story, however, must be reserved for a succeeding chapter.

Our story of the development of Rome from

its foundation in the days of Romulus to the times of the Empire and its decline might easily give the reader an impression of continued wars —of the frailties of human nature—of corruption and confusion. But Rome was infinitely more than this, as her rich legacies to subsequent civilizations splendidly witness. Her Empire was, in the main, an empire of peace; and those who lived under the sway of the Roman eagle felt secure in life and property, and happy in the consciousness of justice and fair play. If Rome had any well-defined objective, it was that of universal peace working itself out through its legal system and military order. Many a time has it been said that at no period have men been quite as happy as when living under the strong and just arm of the Roman Empire. These grave, austere, too often brutal men, with the great mass of Roman "nobodies," contributed to civilization a system of government which in various forms persists to this day: a legal system sound enough to find itself at home in our modern codes; a fairly rich literature in a language full of music and meaning; art and architecture, if not of the Greek standard, yet worthy to stand just beneath it; these and other contributions, especially in municipal government, have become common possessions of all progressive civilizations. Rome's influence has become our inheritance, and we are her grateful beneficiaries.

VIII

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

When Diocletian ascended the throne (284-305 A.D.), the hearts of men were sick of turmoil and mutiny, wanting nothing so much as unity of strength and purpose to meet the grave problems confronting the Empire. The situation was exceedingly critical. Persia was causing new troubles; Egypt saw the rise of a new usurper; Britain presented new problems, and, more significant than all these, the German barbarians were on the move by water and by land. The far-flung frontiers of the Empire would have required the masterful legions of Rome's best days to guard and protect. Protected they must be, but how?

Diocletian realized that the organization of the Empire had to be made over. He set about the task without consulting the Senate, and divided the supervision of the Empire between himself and his colleague, Maximian, with the asssistance of two others—Constantius Chlorus and Galerius, who received the title of Cæsar—while his colleague and himself took the title of Emperor. He retained supreme authority for himself, taking direct supervision over the East, with his capital at Nicomedia. Maximian reigned

over Italy, Africa, and the Islands, from Milan. Galerius reigned over the Illyrian provinces from Sirminium, while Constantius Chlorus went to Treves, from which city he ruled over Gaul, Britain, Spain, and Mauretania.

Such was the famous Tetrarchy scheme of Diocletian. Each ruler managed to get some semblance of order out of the disorders in the various territories. But the scheme—as many another—smashed on the hard rock of human nature. Diocletian in the East—wishing to assist his government there by adopting Eastern manners—tried to throw about himself the aura of Eastern mystery—the pomp and grandeur of Oriental potentates. He spent money without regard to Rome's financial burdens. The scheme was doomed; civil wars began again, and out of the chaos Constantine, the son of Constantius, emerges as victor.

Assisted by his army, together with the vote of the Christians, with whom he was on friendly terms, Constantine had raised himself to the position of sole emperor. He was to drop Diocletian's plan, but was to perfect the system of internal organization; was to make Byzantium the capital of the Empire, and the Christian religion the state religion. As to the last—this was a revolution, indeed. The hunted Christians, concerning whom so many wild and fabulous tales had been told, could now practise the rites of their religion in the open where all could see and

judge. The blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church, and large numbers had been drawn into the fellowship of the hunted Church by the quiet dignity, the self-sacrificing labors, and the clean lives of its members, who comprised not many learned men, not many nobles, not many men of great wealth, but some of all classes, the majority, however, being of the humbler sort.

In establishing his capital by Byzantium, Constantine selected a truly strategic place. The old city was soon transformed into one of the most beautiful cities of the world, and was to be further honored by having its name changed from Byzantium to Constantinople. All the labor of transformation, entailing the expenditure of vast sums of money, was to Constantine a labor of love. The work was pushed forward with so much energy that many of the buildings, thus hastily erected, were preserved later on with great difficulty and additional expense. But while Constantine lived, Constantinople vied with Rome in population, in beauty, and in opulence. Even to-day, the ancient city casts its spell upon all whose eyes see beyond its dirt, and whose ears are attuned to catch other sounds above the babel of voices and of tongues that resounds in its streets.

Internal revolutions disturbed the last years of Constantine. He had outlived the respect and esteem of his subjects. The fatal glamor and

pomp of the East held him in thrall. The aged monarch, whose wisdom and courage and sterling virtues had won the affectionate allegiance of his people, dimmed his glory by adopting strange customs, by ordering foul murders, by giving way to impulses of rapacity and of imbecilic prodigality. Going to Nicomedia on account of his health, he passed away in 337.

On his death the Empire seems to move with hurrying steps to decay; no rulers of great capacity rise to take his place. The administration of government affairs falls into disorder, while the barbarian hordes, better disciplined than ever before, move steadily forward to possess the wasted and spent Empire.

Constantine left his Empire to his three sons—the West to Constantine II; Asia and Egypt to Constantius; and Italy and Africa to Constans. These were brothers only in blood; ambitions, jealousies, conflicts of interest, made the blood-bond a wisp of straw. Constantine was killed in a battle with his brother Constans; the latter was killed by another usurper, who in turn was himself killed by Constantius, now left to rule as sole emperor, from 353-360. The apostate comes after him, Julian by name, cousin of Constantius. At first a Christian—at least nominally—he recants, and sees hope for his country only in a return to the pristine simplicity of Roman paganism. Now are the Christians restricted. But he is kicking against the goad;

Roman Christianity will not budge. The Galilean has won. Julian dies, fighting against the Parthians. His successor, Jovian, being a Christian and somewhat of a diplomat, takes down the bars against the Christians; all is well again. Then follows Valentinian, who is succeeded by his sons, Gratianus and Valentinianus II.

While Valens was ruling the East, at the time when Valentinian ruled the West, a Mongolian tribe called the Huns crossed the Ural Mountains and struck down into Europe. Was the hour of doom about to strike? Some of the people recalled the ancient legend concerning the twelve vultures. Romulus, while standing on the Palatine Hill, saw twelve vultures flying above his head. Calling a Tuscan soothsayer, he inquired the meaning of the portent. The soothsayer informed Romulus that the twelve vultures represented twelve centuries of power for Rome. The people now began to ask the question whether the twelfth vulture had appeared over Rome.

This legend might give the impression that the Romans realized that they were near the day of their doom. Such, however, was not the case. In many respects the might of Rome seemed to have lost little of its vigor, certainly not enough to make her unable to withstand the onslaughts of barbarian hordes she had beaten so often. Rarely do we find that the vision of the leaders, or of the people, is keen enough to pierce the veil of the future, or to see the inevitable issues

of their days. The silent forces of decay had been at work for a long time, but few eyes could mark its progress, or the stage of its present development. Some heralded the times as the best Rome had ever known; others went about their daily tasks bearing the burdens imposed upon them with consideration only for these. The day was soon to come, however, when men would bow their heads in the presence of inevitable doom. They were to see "the obsequies of Rome" carried out to their minutest details.

We have seen that much of the reason for Rome's decay is to be found in its financial and social corruption, in the dissolution of its moral fiber, and in the universal belief that all men had their price, and every office its illicit reward. Trade and commerce with India, China, and Asia had drained the country of its gold; for the East traded little with the West. The enormous and irresponsible expenses of government had placed on the backs of the tax-paying middle classes burdens too heavy to be borne; many of these sought relief by entering the army, but this avenue was to be closed to them. The decay of the backbone of any nation—the middle classes—spells inevitable ruin to the nation as a whole.

No longer did the Roman consider it a patriotic duty to enroll in the legions and help to maintain the standard of the armies. Patriotism, if not entirely dead, was too weak to be heard

above the strident voices of self-interest and self-preservation. The teachings of Epicureanism and of Stoicism, stripped of their former dignity, furthered the work of disintegration. The Christians, living in the main in another world, and with their apocalyptic visions engrossing too much of their interest, paid little attention to the duties of a state to which they could give but little allegiance.

We recall the significance of Sulla's entry into the political fray in 82 B.C. by aid of his strong army. The old-time discipline has passed away. Its strength has been used to raise and to depose emperors, and to make its will known in decisive fashion, irrespective of the wishes of the people or of the constitution of the state. Roman citizens prefer to stay at home to live their lives in peace. Their places are taken by German mercenaries, highly paid, efficient, brave and faithful. Some of these rise to high places in the army—but they are not Romans. The Roman legions are relieved of the solitary life on distant frontiers, and are brought home to more congenial places within the Empire. How could such an army meet the fierce and persistent attacks of the barbarians?

These in the main are some of the most important of the internal causes for the decay of Rome. We would not overemphasize them, and we would not understate them. Rome at its best would have found its energies wholly employed

to beat back these barbarian attacks, and what could she do when neither the spirit nor the flesh was able to answer the call? The later Empire had become degraded to an Oriental despotism. It was due to pass, and in its passing to close the chapter on the ancient world, for other hands were to form the beginnings of the modern.

Barbarian tribes had for a long time been seeping through the frontiers of the Roman Empire. Even Augustus had permitted large numbers of them to settle peaceably upon lands where they were privileged to carry on their life according to their customs. Now the seepage becomes a flood. In the North the Teutonic tribes—Alemani, Burgundians, Suevi, Goths—spread themselves over the Empire. Drive them back as often as Rome could, on they came with fresh energy and fresh forces. Tacitus tells us that these German barbarians were fairly decent folk, moral, respectful to women, faithful to a friend, and loyal to an oath. Their weaknesses were intemperance, wild and cruel customs, and an unrestrainable weakness for gambling. Besides these defects, it did not take them long to add to their list the pleasing vices of their Roman acquaintances.

As often as these forces were driven back so often did Rome attract them by its reputed wealth, and their love for plunder could not be stayed. This was not by any means the only

reason, or even the chief, for their marauding expeditions. It was their nature to wander into fresh territories, where the struggle for existence would not be so intense. And it is also probable that they felt the pressure of forces lying behind them—pushing them forward, now by fear, and again by population pressure. Long years before, in the days of the early settlement of the Ægean territory by the Greeks, we saw members of their blood pushing into those lands, and pushing out the inhabitants by pillage, by terror, and by fierce conquest. To that extent is history being repeated. And even as those barbarian Greeks were going to stay to give to the world one of its indispensable civilizations, so these German-Aryan tribes are going to settle down to the same task, giving the world a new foundation upon which to build a new civilization, in most respects greatly superior to anything the old world ever dreamed about. Of course, they destroyed, they pillaged, they burned, they were guilty of atrocious crimes. But this business of wrecking a decrepit and corrupt Empire is hardly ever the work of those who have only a stomach for dainty jobs. One writer has characterized it as "the greatest calamity that ever befell the human race." So does distance lend enchantment to the view, especially when one worships at a little Roman shrine within the heart.

At the beginning of the fifth century these

barbarians pour into the Roman provinces with their wives and children and all the equipment necessary for a permanent stay. Honorius, thoroughly alarmed, concentrates his forces within Italy, where he makes a successful stand—but only for a time. Gaul is thrown wide open to them. Britain has been left to its fate. Triumphantly, drunk with success, they come from the Rhine down to the Loire; and, like most conquering hordes, they ravage and loot, they feast and destroy. St. Jerome tells us that "if the ocean had inundated Gaul, it would have done less damage."

This inundation is one of the most momentous events in history. Barbarian kingdoms were set up throughout the Empire. The Visigoths established a kingdom in Spain and southern Gaul, until the Saracens upset it in 711. The Burgundians settled in southeastern Gaul, and the Vandals found a fitting cemetery in North Africa. In Britain, an Anglo-Saxon kingdom had been set up; and so the story goes. In Italy the German chiefs soon grew tired of the ineptitude of the Romans, hesitant tho they were to assume the purple; but Odoacer, chief of the Heruli and the Rugii, gently lifted the weak Romulus Augustulus off the throne (476 A.D), received the title of Patrician, and ruled Italy in the name of the Eastern emperor.

Thus have the mighty fallen. The grandeur that was Rome has become a memory. Italy, the

heart of the mightiest of ancient empires, is now a mere province of the Eastern Roman Empire. The deep hatred of the Italian people is quieted by fear of the formidable barbarians who now rule them. Some respect the splendid courage of these German chiefs, upon whom the honors of state have descended; but no one loves them. To the credit of Odoacer be it said, however, he respected the institutions as well as the prejudices of his subjects. But Italy itself had fallen into tragic decay. Misery and desolation could everywhere be seen. Agriculture had long since discarded science. The population had declined; food was not sufficient to meet the needs of the people. The three ancient enemies of the human race—war, famine, and pestilence—had wreaked their worst upon this land of warriors, the fair land of Italy.

The continuance of the Eastern Roman Empire for nearly a thousand years—until 1456, when the Turks captured Constantinople—gave scope for the rise and development of what is called Byzantine Civilization.

We noted that Constantine had energetically set about the self-imposed task of making over old Byzantium into a city fit for an emperor, and for the capital of an Empire. Fortunately for him, he had the stores of the Empire at his disposal; so that we find him conveying ornaments, statues of heroes and of gods, tombs and trophies, and as many other treasures as he

could lay his hands on, to fit into their appropriate places in the new city. One who witnessed the opening ceremonies of dedication is reputed to have said that "nothing was now wanting save the souls of the illustrious dead."

The selection of this site by Constantine was most fortunate. The western section of the Empire comprised a vast territory whose cities and important military centers were widely separated one from the other. This proved fatal when the barbarians overran the provinces, because the lines could not all be protected. In this regard the Eastern Empire was much more favorably situated. The separating sea protected it from its enemies, but also provided a convenient highway for the conveyance of troops. Cities were closer together, and the military garrisons were not so far apart as to cause discontented legions to voice their disaffection over wearisome journeys. More fortunate still was the fact that, unlike the West, the East had no diversity of tongues to give cause for suspicion or to make intercourse difficult. The East consisted mainly of Greeks, and the memory of their common inheritance with the Romans produced a sense of unity which the West was never to know. In the West there existed for a long time a strong pagan party, and several divisive religious elements. From this distance in time we may easily see how impossible it was for the Roman Empire to avoid separation into East and West. It was

a logical, reasonable, and inevitable separation, even tho both parts went along ostensibly as one, for many centuries.

One of the greatest achievements recorded to the credit of any of these Byzantine emperors, is that associated with the life of Justinian. The victories which he was fortunate enough to win over his enemies meant little in the march of human events. But to his inspiration and persistent interest in justice we owe a lasting debt in the form of his revision of the jurisprudence of his day, and the digests made of it, in the *Code,* the *Pandects,* and the *Institutions.* Here we find distilled the legal wisdom of the Romans, which was to have a great influence upon succeeding legal systems and codes, down to those of our own day.

Very few things are more necessary for the well-being of any state than a complete reformation of its legal system. Our own day, and our own experience, witness to the truth of this statement; and very few tasks may be as arduous, as overwhelming in their proportions, as this. During the life of the Roman Empire there had been gathered together from its earliest days, tens of thousands of laws and legal opinions, sufficient to fill a thousand volumes and to dampen the ardor of the most enthusiastic seeker for legal truth. When Justinian ascended the throne he called together a small group of scholars and authorities, and laid upon

them the task of revising the ordinances of his predecessors since the time of Hadrian, as these were found in the Gregorian, Hermogenian, and Theodosian codes. He told them that they must purge all errors and contradictions, take out whatever they found obsolete or superfluous, and select the wise and salutary laws best adapted to the practise of tribunals and the use of his subjects. The new code was completed in fourteen months, and received the signature of Justinian. Then the laws were accurately copied and distributed. Compared with what was to follow, however, this task was relatively easy.

There must now be extracted from the decisions and conjectures of judges, and from the questions and disputes of Roman lawyers, the real meaning of the laws—their true spirit. In three years this task also was completed, and the *Digest of Pandects* is an abstract of 150,000 sentences, chosen from about three million. The *Institutes* contain the essential elements of Roman law. Justinian declared the *Code*, the *Pandects* and the *Institutes* to be the only legitimate system of civil jurisprudence. This remarkable monument of human labor, of human wisdom, and of the sound judgment of one of the most legal-minded of all the nations of the earth, was destined to be a source of legal knowledge and inspiration for thirteen hundred years. The sixth century may well be called the Age of Justinian.

The succeeding centuries—until the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453—drag along with their tale of wars, of mutinies, of great courage, and of ignoble corruption.

Glance at the picture of Constantinople in the last days of Roman rule. Beyond the walls of the great city can be heard the cry of the Moslems, "God is God, there is but one God, and Mohammed is the Apostle of God!" Within the city, Christians are pouring forth their complaints, repenting of their sins, carrying the image of the Virgin in their penetential processions. Voices are raised against the emperor for his stubborn refusal to surrender: the minds of the people are distraught with fear of the horrors to be inflicted upon them by the Turks or they sigh for the repose and security which they dare imagine might come to them in Turkish servitude. There is a summoning of the noblest of the Greeks and of the allies to the palace of the king, but the last speech of Paleologos becomes "the funeral oration of the Roman Empire." The emperor, with a few intimates, retires to the Church of All Wisdom, St. Sophia, and there receives the sacrament of holy communion. But the great Christian Church is doomed to become a Mohammedan mosque, and to remain such to this hour.

When day breaks, the Turks surround the city, the assault begins by land and sea, and the last citadel of ancient Rome falls into the bloody

hands of despoiling Moslems. Into the streets, herding together like terror-stricken cattle, go the people. Homes are deserted, doors are thrust open by looting hands. Suddenly the people remember their church, St. Sophia, and a multitude of fathers, mothers, children, priests, monks, and sacred virgins crowd within the church, barring the doors behind them. The Turks, they hope, will not dare to cross the sacred threshold. But they do not know their Turkish conquerors. Down go the doors before blood-stained axes. A moment's hesitation to give the conquerors time to survey their loot; then youth, beauty, and all those with any appearance of wealth are tied and led out as prey —prey for passions unrestrained. The city is a bedlam of cries, of wild and terrified shoutings. Wives and husbands forever separated, children crying for their parents, sacred virgins for the preservation of their honor, priests and monks to God for pity. It is the oft-told tale of man's inhumanity to man, of the bloody lust of the conqueror, and of the abject misery of the conquered.

St. Sophia is stripped of much of its beauty and robbed of its sacred wealth. Sacrilege means nothing to the Turk save as it applies to his own religion. All day long the city is given up to looting, while the happy Sultan, with his retinue of viziers, pashas, guards, makes a triumphal march through the streets. When Friday comes,

the Muezzin ascends the lofty tower of St. Sophia and cries an invitation to Mohammedan worship. An evil magician has waved his wand over Christian Constantinople. Rome is dead—long live the Sultan!

In the story of civilization Constantinople has her own peculiar place. Even tho she was unable in this fifteenth century to keep back these Moslem hordes, she had done so long enough to render an inestimable service to the civilization which we know and prize. When Slavic barbarians, coming down from the North, had sought to overthrow her, she stood and held them in leash. In many respects she was a buffer-state receiving shocks which otherwise might well have injured the slowly developing civilization of the West.

Byzantine civilization, as expressed in its art, has exercised so far-reaching an influence both upon Europe and upon Asia that it must be noted as one of the great contributions of the Eastern world, as that world was modified and fused into the Western. For Byzantium was no mere city at the time when Constantine selected it as the site of his new capital. Settled by the Greeks, its early history is lost in the obscurities of many legends. One glance at its situation reveals at once its prime importance as a first-rate port and trading center. During its long history it had inevitably passed through many hands and many vicissitudes. Being a first-class

seaport town with a great territory surrounding it, it attracted people from all lands; and the resulting mixed population of inferior grade was one of its problems. But, in language, in ideals, in cultural outlook, it was thoroughly Greek. Even those who were not born Greeks, but had acquired the tongue, acquired also as much of its spirit as they were capable of assimilating. When Constantine transformed the city, it was not a transformation into other cultural forms than the classic.

Byzantine art is—when all other contributions are weighed—the chief contribution to the world of a thousand years of the civilization that centered in this city on the Bosporus. Its essential genius is to be found in a harmonious blending of Oriental and Roman art; and its influence was to be profoundly felt down into the Middle Age. The rude drawings of the early Christians were the timid efforts of untrained hands attempting to represent their religious ideals. But for a long time after the Church had come into its own, it seemed to have appropriated Byzantine art as the choice medium for the expression of its awakened spirit, the outward manifestation of its faith. Not only did the early Church take this Byzantine medium as its own, it modified and enriched it.

It is not for us to forget that during those long dark centuries when the barbarian tribes of the West, with their rude customs, were ad-

justing themselves to a settled life, and laying the foundation for another type of civilization, the Eastern Empire at Constantinople kept the lamp of letters burning as brightly as possible. The scholars of the Greek world had flocked to Constantinople as the most congenial place for the cultivation of their interests. All the light and learning, the rich treasures of old Greece, were affectionately nurtured and preserved. It was one of the few places, in an otherwise dark world, where men sought to preserve the glories of the past, the enlightenment of their own minds, an eversensitive appreciation of the achievements of those who had lived the life of the spirit and who had given eternal witness of its ineffable richness.

The time came in the West when men looked about them on the evidences of former greatness, the greatness of Rome and of Greece, and began to ask questions; moved to do so by a new spirit brooding within them. Economic stability had come after political stability. With economic stability there came wealth, and with wealth, leisure. Ancient buildings and statues, bleached and toned by age, bore silent witness to the past —to the glories of former cultures. "The valley was filled with bones, and lo, they were very dry. 'Son of man, can these bones live?' And breath was caused to enter into them, and they began to live, sinews and flesh and breath, and

they lived, and stood upon their feet, an exceeding great army."

For the West, for Italy, the breath of life was the spirit of these Byzantine Greeks. Italy came at last to her own. Again the voice of Hellas was to call men to a banquet-table set in a wilderness—a wilderness soon to blossom as a garden. This time, however, the call is not from Athens, but from Byzantium. Hands of invisible spirits touch the souls of the West, day comes flooding the world with a new light—the light of the Renaissance.

Keats has told us that "A thing of beauty is a joy forever," but the beauty must be seen, and it must be appreciated before joy is felt. There is no doubt at all that Byzantine art, and especially the Byzantine scholars who flocked to Italy before and after the fall of Constantinople, greatly aided the West in its appointed hour to know something of the joy that so naturally and spontaneously inspired the Greeks. The West was hardly ever without its followers of a stern Hebraic morality: it was always to be challenged by loyal servants of a crucified Jesus who knew no compromise with the things of this world. But it was also to have those evidences of another kind of world-view, and was to be challenged by the followers of another way, even the Greek. These two streams have been flowing through the channel of our civilization from those early days to our own; they mingle, but

they never mix. We are suffering to-day from the fact that we have not yet discovered the secret of uniting the rich ethical content of Hebraism with that joyous appreciation of nature, that rapture of life and for life, which was so characteristic of the Greeks, in one undivided mind and heart, so as to see life steadily and to see it whole.

IX

THE EARLY MIDDLE AGE AND CHARLEMAGNE

If one is to set a date to the beginning of medieval history, 476 A.D is more appropriate than any other. The German Odoacer removed the last remaining Roman from the throne of the Western Empire at that time. To recall what has been said, the Romans did not attach to this event the significance later given to it. The Roman Empire still existed—tho with its capital in the East. The division of Theodosius—who seemed to be more concerned about the Church than the State—had given place to a new unity within the Empire by 476. And the kings of the West, ruling over the newly-established German states, seem all to have consistently recognized the fact that Cæsar still ruled—tho from Constantinople.

We know, however, that this unity was more theoretical than actual. The German rulers exercised their sway within their respective dominions with characteristic independence. These early German states were of short duration, for they changed about with kaleidoscopic rapidity. Ostrogoths and Visigoths, Lombards and Vandals, came and went.

Theodoric the Great in 493 overthrew Odoa-

cer and set up his kingdom in Italy. His rule was characterized by justice and wisdom. Having spent about ten years in Constantinople while a youth, he had cultivated a deep and lasting regard for Roman law. Notwithstanding this fact, he had proved himself a dangerous and expensive enemy to the emperor, having led a number of devastating expeditions against him, and threatened the capture of the capital itself. When he came to rule over Italy he could be expected to show but slight regard for his titular master. No more powerful or independent king ruled within the Empire than this man whom his contemporaries called "The Great." He governed his kingdom with enlightened good judgment, and sought by every means to aid and protect the industry of his subjects. To the amazement of the other barbarians of the West, who stood in respectful awe before the might of his will and the power of his army, Theodoric did not extend his conquering sway over the other countries. He was satisfied to put up the sword, to redress the evils in his new kingdom, and to organize its life upon a foundation of civil government where duties and rights would be equally regarded. During his reign of thirty-three years he sought to unite the Goths and the Romans, but failed, either through lack of genius or because of the refractory elements within the two peoples. While giving his Goths a maximum of freedom, he nevertheless adhered

with almost pathetic attachment to a political system handed down by his Roman predecessors. When he paid a visit to Rome for six months (he had his capital in Ravenna), the Romans praised the courteous demeanor of this barbarian king, who promised them a just and legal government—in a speech which was later inscribed on brass. Here Theodoric gazed in wonder and respectful admiration on the evidences of former greatness. And to the credit of these German barbarian rulers be it said, they sought by laws and royal edicts to prevent abuse, neglect, and depredations from hastening the decay of the monuments of a past which still had power to cast a spell upon the imaginations of such as they.

Rome held no attraction for Theodoric as a capital. The elemental simplicities of his barbarian life called for the gardens, the orchards, and the fields of Ravenna, where the last Emperors had set up their capital. He had given his encouraging assistance to the revival of literature; and had exalted such a writer as Cassiodorus to high office within the state. Italy enjoyed a miniature renaissance, and civilization for a time began to move on higher levels. Unfortunately, we have to record the fact that toward the close of Theodoric's life his sense of justice was dimmed, and his customary wisdom seemed to leave him. The twin spirits of suspicion and cruelty took possession of him; and Boethius,

whom he had showered with favors and raised to office, was the most famous victim of their influence. Cast into prison and fettered with chains, this famous Roman Senator, in the freedom of his spirit, composed that cherished volume, *The Consolations of Philosophy.*

During the reign of Theodoric religious differences within the Christian Church began to emerge, the character of which it is necessary for us to describe.

By the Edict of Milan (313) Constantine extended freedom of religious worship to all, which raised Christianity to a preeminent position. In 325 he called the Council of Nicea in order to settle matters of doctrine. Followers of Arius had denied the divinity of Christ. The Council by a majority vote denounced the heresy. The Goths, however, were fated to become Christians by the Arian route—while Italy was safely attached to the professions of the Nicene declarations. The tolerant Theodoric was not anxious to unleash the passions of ardent Christians—tho divided into two camps—so he assumed the legal supremacy of the Church, while recognizing the dignity and importance of the bishop of Rome, to whom the name Pope had been attached. The matter could not rest there permanent in peace; for, whereas most of the German tribes became Arians, Italy could do no other than think of them as heretics. The Italians respected the armed heresy of these

rude barbarians, so as an outlet for their pent-up emotions they expended their Christian rage against the Jews—a precedent which was to be followed, off and on as occasion warranted, down into the shining light of the twentieth century.

While the good work of Theodoric was going forward there settled in Gaul a German tribe called the Franks, which was to form a solid and progressive nucleus of a nation. This nation became the French, and Gaul became France. No other German tribe was to play any such important part in the future development of Europe as these Franks. It was said of them that "They were born with a great love of war, they are brought up with the same passion, and to retreat in battle is unknown to them. If they are worsted through their enemies' superiority in numbers or through a disadvantageous position, they never succumb to fear; they die, but they are not vanquished." Together with these fighting qualities they possessed a fine legal system, and were under a strong royal power. Many a time had these Franks sought to entrench themselves upon the soil of Gaul. Behind them were the equally brave and perhaps more fierce Saxons, whom Charlemagne was to find so hard a nut to crack in his efforts to round out an empire. Many a time had the Roman armies defeated themselves into the belief that they had utterly destroyed the Franks.

only to see them rise again as tho from the ground. And almost as often, claimants for the emperorship sought and obtained the armed assistance of these famous warriors, who received therefor large grants of land within the empire. Roman disputes and internal dissensions greatly aided the progress of these Franks, so that about 355 A.D. we see them coming like a tidal wave across the Rhine and into Gaul.

Their greatest king was Clovis I (481-511), who came to the throne when but a lad of fifteen years. During a reign of thirty years, he united the various Frankish tribes, firmly established his Gallic kingdom, and left, at his death, a kingdom more extensive than that of modern France. In 493 he married Clotilda—daughter of the king of the Burgundians. Being an ardent Christian, Clotilda sought the conversion of her pagan husband to her faith. But she had difficult material to work on, and it is doubtful whether her efforts alone would have produced the desired change. No doubt she was aided by the officials of the Church, for the Church considered it almost a matter of life and death that this mighty ruler should come into the fold, where he could be of signal service. However that may be, the chroniclers of the Church record that the long-prayed-for conversion came about while Clovis was fighting near Strassburg (Zulpich) in a battle that was going against him. In his desperation he, like a drowning man,

turned to the God of his wife and made a bargain to the effect that if God turned the tide of battle, then Clovis would change his religion. No sooner vowed than the face of heaven was changed to a scroll on which the word "victory" was written. When Christmas came around, he kept his vow, was baptized, and saw to it that three thousand of his nobles did likewise. Rheims has many historical incidents to its credit, and perhaps this is not the least of them.

This event gave the religious situation a new set-up. All the other German tribes were Arian Christians—hereties, of course, of the deepest dye. Now that the Franks had become Roman Christians, momentous influences were born, which in their maturity were to have far-reaching consequences. In due time the Papacy and the Frankish rulers were to form a sort of holy alliance, which should do much to determine the character and complexion of the history of western Europe.

Many have doubted the sincerity of this rather desperate conversion of Clovis, and, judged by the events of his later life, his paganism seems to crop out too often in brutal wars, and in such acts as his murdering of the other Frankish chiefs to secure to himself and his posterity the whole territory. But we must not be unmindful of the fact that a wide diver-

gence between profession and practise may be found in other men and in more peaceful times.

Clovis died in 511, and his kingdom passed to his four sons. One reigned from Metz; another from Orleans; another at Paris, and the fourth at Soissons. These four sons inherited from their father everything but his genius. This is the famous, or infamous, Merovingian House. Clotilda, the widow of Clovis, was as much a pagan in her practises as her husband had been in his wars. Vengeance for wrongs inflicted upon her family was a commission she gave her sons to execute. Three of them accepted, and in the execution of their vengeance one child had a knife plunged into its heart; another, not yet seven, went the same way; by the same way went their nurses, their pages, and their servants—all murdered to satisfy a saint's revenge.

We shall be profited nothing in recalling the crimes, the murders, the gross and beastly immoralities, the worse than pagan depravities of this, one of the most detestable dynasties that ever spawned its vices upon a long-suffering world. These Merovingian kings became utterly inefficient and degenerate. History calls them the "Do-nothing" kings. They certainly did nothing to entitle them to a place in the memory of those who respect decency and righteousness.

The incapacity of these rulers made it possible for those who were close to them to assume

powers not legally their own. Within the palace itself the most important person next to the king was the Major Domo—the steward of the royal possessions. Occupying so important a position, and impressed by the ineptitude of the kings, it was inevitable that these men should exercise their wits and their powers to gain supremacy. For a century the struggle goes on between the Major Domos and the kings, until Pepin of Heristal, having united the "Mayors of the Palace," as they were called, of the four Frankish kingdoms, found that the power of the kingdoms had come into his hands. With rare tact and moderation, directed by a vigorous intellect, he gained the love of the people, the respect of the lords, and a secure hold upon the country. It had looked as if the Frankish power was to pass. It was left to Pepin to unify the country, and to equip it for the conquest of Europe. He was astute enough to realize that his strength with the nobles lay in not assuming the purple. Had he done so, the probability is that the nobles would have carried their resentment to the extent of an organized revolt.

Pepin's son Charles, later nicknamed Charles Martel ("Charles the Hammer,") also became a Mayor of the Palace, and exercised all the powers of a king without actually taking the office. In 732 he succeeded—after a series of strenuous battles—in beating back the invading Mohammedans, who were streaming up into

France through Spain. This battle of Tours is one of the most significant events in the history of Western Europe, and it will be necessary for us to unfold its significance by recalling the amazing story of the rise and expansion of the Arab Empire under the spur of the religion of Mohammed.

While the Franks were establishing their position in Gaul, a new power was rising in the East. Arabia, the ancient home of the Semitic peoples, was, because of its isolation, cut off from the main currents of the world's history. In the seventh century the country was divided up into areas within which nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes, as well as tribes which had settled down to the stationary life, lived and fought with each other. All these groups maintained their own distinctive religious beliefs, and practised their own appropriate rites. A majority, however, were pagans and practised idolatry. A black stone—upon which the head of Jacob was supposed to have rested—was preserved in the temple at Mecca, where it was under the care of the priestly tribe of the Koreishites. Of these people was Mohammed; and out of these conditions there arose the religion of Islam: "God is one God—there is no other, and Mohammed is his prophet."

Mohammed (569-632) came of a noble family, but at the time of his birth it was greatly impoverished. Joining himself to a caravan as a

driver, his brooding disposition found food for thought in the condition of his people, and in the forms of the Jewish and Christian faiths, with which he came in touch in the cities he visited. One wonders if the subsequent history of Islam would have had a different character had Mohammed been privileged to see either pure Judaism or pure Christianity, instead of the decadent forms with which he came into touch. The necessity of earning his own living was removed, when he won the heart and hand of the rich widow, Khadija, his former employer. Until he reached the age of forty, he seems to have given himself up to quiet meditation and to isolation, due in a measure to the fact that he suffered from some acute nervous trouble. In its extreme form his affliction was accompanied by hallucinations, which he and his friends interpreted as divine visions. In 610 he went forth on his crusade to convert his fellow countrymen to Islam. During his life he had become intimately acquainted with the contents of the Hebrew Bible, and almost as much so with the New Testament. But his fellow townsmen in Mecca would have none of his teachings. Probably incited by the Koreishites, who feared the passing of their power, the crowd drove Mohammed out of the city, and he had to take refuge in Medina. To-day the Moslems still consecrate this flight, or hegira, as the beginning of their era.

In Medina a vision comes from God to Mohammed at a convenient hour, informing him that if his countrymen will not be persuaded by fair words, then the sword must be the instrument of their salvation. Then begins that era of bloody evangelism which in time converts the Koreishites, and the rest follow suit in due time. When Mohammed dies in 632, the main mass of Moslems recognize his father-in-law, Abu-Bekr, as Caliph, while others declare for Ali, Mohammed's son-in-law and first disciple. This is the beginning of a long and bitter war between the followers of Ali and those of Abu-Bekr. The former come to be called Shiites, while the latter are known as Sunnites, or the members of the orthodox party. Even to-day, Turk and Arabian join in an inspiring fellowship to sing their hymns of hate against the Persians, who are Shiites. Abu-Bekr died in 634, and his mantle fell on the shoulders of Omar.

Soon after the death of Mohammed the Moslems began their holy war against the pagan, and more particularly against the infidel, meaning the Hebrew and the Christian. This work of conquest was greatly aided by the internal conditions of the countries that were soon to see these new champions of Allah march victoriously over them. Had there been strong military organizations to meet them, or had the people of the various countries been animated by a sim-

ilar religious ferocity, this part of the story would not have to be written. But Syria fell to the Moslems without much difficulty. Jerusalem, the city of David, became a religious citadel of Islam. The famous Mosque of Omar was to rear itself over the ruins of the Temple of Solomon. Egypt was easy to take—save Alexandria, which required fourteen months. Here occurred one of the greatest atrocities of history, an atrocity which one never finds it in one's heart to forgive—the burning of the famous library of Alexandria. But, remembering Louvain, perhaps one should not be too hard on those wild nomads of the seventh century. The ancient city of Memphis was laid smoldering in its ruins, but Cairo was to rise in its place. Then followed Persia, and Central Asia. Where the sword had won such victories the cause of Allah was advanced, and the Moslem creed was repeated from the deserts of Arabia to the valley of the Indus.

Other nations besides the Arabian had realized before that the rude and simple virtues which had given them vigor and an indomitable purpose were liable to be dissipated by the corruptive influences of wealth, ease, and security. To these Arabians there came, with irresistible beguilements, the sensuous luxuries of Orientalism. It is the way of all flesh, when the Orient casts its spell. Divisions and contentions arose, then a civil war lasting for six years. The year

750 marks the close of a period—and the beginning of another. The Moslems are on the march again, but Constantinople resists; two Moslem fleets are burned, and the great city is still Christian. Then follows a series of splendid successes for the followers of Mohammed. Their arms in Asia have moved on to the frontiers of China. Carthage suffers destruction again in 698.

The lands of western Europe have long since captured the imagination of the Moslems. In 711 they match their forces against the Visigoths, and lower Spain is in their hands. They press on northward through Spain, across the Pyrenees, into the heart of France. They are to be stopped, however, in 732 by the redoubtable Charles Martel at the battle of Tours.

What influence did the Arabs exert upon the civilization of the West? Much greater than is commonly supposed. Particularly was this the case in Spain. Here they set up schools—academies—libraries. It is in the natural sciences that we see their excellence—in botany, in chemistry, in medicine. We note their genius in architecture by recalling the Alcázar of Seville, the mosque of Córdoba, and the Alhambra of Granada. Later Europe was to know and appreciate the cloths and silks from Murcia and Seville, the leather of Córdoba, and the wonderful arms of Toledo. Spain under their administration prospered agriculturally to such a degree as to be able to support a population

greatly in excess of anything since their day. They carried on a thriving trade with many lands, and bade fair to extend their dominion by the arts of peace where they could not extend it by means of the sword.

We left the story of the Franks with the victory of Charles Martel in 732 over the Arabs. This battle determined the future complexion of western Europe. Had the battle been lost, we probably would be writing the political history of the Arab kingdoms in western Europe.

Charles did not take the kingship away from the Merovingians, as he might well have done. But no such scruples stood in the path of his son, Pepin the Short. Childeric III—a thorough imbecile, the last of the notorious Merovingians—was deposed from his exalted office by act of the Assembly of the Nation; and Pepin the Short was proclaimed king in his place in 752. Pope Stephen was delighted to confirm the election by making the journey to Pepin's court, where the holy anointing oil was poured upon his head—as Samuel the prophet had poured it on the head of Saul. Pepin was elected king by the people: but he was anointed king "by the grace of God." This phrase signified something of more than ceremonial interest. It meant a restoration of the old Eastern—but more particularly, in this case, the old Hebrew—idea that, while a king was the ruler of his people, he was the anointed of God. Religious-minded people were

to look on the king's person as sacred; it raised the kingly office to new heights and gave the kings a wall of protection that stood fast for many of them in their day of need.

The head of the Church, the pope, had done his duty by Pepin, and had rendered him a distinct service. Pepin was expected to reciprocate, and the pope was not disappointed. The barbarian Lombards, crude and fierce, were causing the pope a great deal of trouble within Italy by their invasions. Pepin crossed the Alps to assist the work of resisting these Lombards. Having succeeded in the task, he gracefully added to the lands of the head of the Church by giving the pope a portion of the coast on the Adriatic Sea. This was called "Pepin's Donation." On this physical basis was laid the temporal power of the popes, from which was to radiate their temporal sovereignty. The recent adjustment of the dispute between the pope and the Italian government—a modern phase of this subject—has come about through the efforts of the present occupant of that high office and Mussolini, the real ruler of present-day Italy.

When Pepin died in 768, his kingdom, which extended to South and Central Germany, was divided between his two sons, Carloman and Charles. The latter is known to history as Charles the Great, or Charlemagne, unquestionably the greatest figure of the Middle Age. At the death of Carloman, Charlemagne was made

ruler of the entire Frankish kingdom, and his reign of more than forty years has remained a towering landmark of history.

Let us look at the main outlines of this great man's achievements. With him we begin the actual story of medieval life, and see the dim foreshadowings of the modern world. Strange as it may seem, the conditions prevailing under Charlemagne now seem to us a good deal like the conditions just after prehistoric times. Or, to put it in another way, we westerners of this modern day would have felt infinitely more at home in Athens in the year 500 B.C. or in Alexandria in the year 250 B.C. than we would have felt in any town of western Europe during the whole of the eighth and well into the ninth century A.D. Saying this, we must remember, however, that we are dealing with the efforts of latecomers into the story of civilization. Ultra modernists have made the Dark Age too dark; it is Egyptian, with a darkness that can be felt. On the other hand, those of the medieval cast of mind have looked upon that period as the radiant age of transcendent faith. Neither is right, and yet neither is entirely wrong.

We are not certain of the date of Charles's birth, but the year 742 is generally favored. Nothing authentic is known of his early life. That he bore a kingly presence, and had a large and robust frame, tho not tall, the chronicles bear witness; also that he wore a genial aspect,

was an excellent swimmer, and took his exercise on horseback. His dress was the typical dress of his Frankish countryman.

> He wore a linen shirt and linen thigh-coverings; then a tunic with a silken hem and stockings. He wound garters round his legs, and clad his feet in shoes. His chest and shoulders were protected from the cold by a doublet of otter and sable skins; wrapped in a sea-blue cloak, he always carried a sword at his girdle, this and the hilt being interlaced silver and gold. Sometimes he wore a sword studded with gems, but on only high days or holidays, or on the visit of some foreign embassy. He held the foreign styles of dress in the greatest contempt, however fine they might be, nor would he ever submit to be robed in them.

In other words, he was a thoroughgoing Frank, Teuton in birth, Roman in religion. He made his capital at Aix-la-Chapelle, and cared so little for Paris that he visited it but once. During his long, turbulent reign, Charles found ample opportunity to exercise the arts of war. The most exasperating and troublesome wars he had were those directed against the brave Saxons between the Rhine and the Elbe. These Saxons never knew when they were beaten—at least not long enough to keep them peaceful—or to make them stick to their vows of quiet obedience. His campaigns against them continued, off and on, from 772 to 804. At last the work was done, and they even agreed to his demand that they

become Christians. Charles thought he had to resort to extreme measures with them; so he transported large numbers of Franks into Saxon territory, and of Saxons into France. In between his Saxon campaigns, Charles found time to conquer Bavaria, move the Avars from their lands, invade Spain against the Arabs, and put an end to the Lombard monarchy in Italy (in 774), raising the iron crown upon his own head as King of the Lombards. By the time he had completed his conquering expeditions, his kingdoms included all of modern France, a strip on the southern slopes of the Pyrenees, North Germany to the Elbe, South Germany to Bohemia, the land of the Avars between the Danube and the Adriatic, and Italy to a point south of Rome. His relations with the pope were cordial, but not obsequious. When Leo III became a victim of a revolution, assaulted, wounded, and imprisoned by the nephews of his predecessor, he managed to escape from his captors to the camp of Charles in Saxony. Charles heeded the plea, marched upon Rome, succeeded in his mission, was given high honors by the pope, and crowned with a golden crown to the loud acclaim of the citizens: "To Carolus Augustus, crowned by God, mighty and pacific emperor, be life and victory!" This occurred on Christmas Day, 800, an auspicious day, an auspicious event. It was a renewal of the imperial title, but this time "crowned by God."

It would be a mistake to suggest that we are here dealing with a mere conqueror. Charlemagne reorganized his government, incorporating in it the Assemblies or Diets, the Capitularies or Edicts, and the Missi Dominici or royal deputies. In the course of his long reign he held thirty-five meetings of the diets in various cities, where the progress of his kingdom was noted. The sixty edicts issued were virtually laws, in which he stated his mind concerning the needs of the Church, the schools, the education of the clergy, etc. The royal deputies were inspectors and magistrates. These were the eyes and ears of the emperor, and served the purpose of cultivating and maintaining a united Empire.

The greatest contributions of Charlemagne remain to be stated. These were unquestionably in the direction of learning and education. Charles never learned the art of writing, tho he diligently tried to master it during such spare hours as he enjoyed. Surrounding himself with the most learned men of his day, not only did he delight in literature and learning, but he strove to spread them abroad throughout the Church and the Empire. In one of his capitularies he says: "Let there be schools in which boys may learn to read." And he urges the priests to instruct the young in the Christian faith, and tells those whose occupation it is to write to see to it that they write well. He seems to have been thoroughly convinced that educa-

tion and enlightenment could not be spread abroad throughout his realm unless good teachers could be obtained. To this end he brought to his court one of the most learned men of his time, Alcuin of England.

It would be impossible to describe the condition of the minds of the people in western Europe at this time. The period from 600 to 850 can rightly be called the Dark Age, in the full meaning of the term. From the highest to the lowest, and within the Church itself, where the greatest learning resided, one finds the most appalling ignorance. The first task that Alcuin undertook was the reformation of the Palace School, instituting there a system of elementary education. To this school came all the members of the royal household, including the king and queen. By inspiration of Alcuin, Charles set about the task of educating the clergy, established monastery schools, and brought monks from Italy and Ireland to teach in them.

The immediate result of all these labors, however, seems to have been meager. The difficulties to be overcome were too immense. Had the Church been enlightened, the result might have been otherwise; but its leaders were almost as ignorant as the laity. Some foundation-stones for a future Renaissance were laid, however; at least the drift of ignorance had been arrested. In this regard Europe was never to be as dark again as it had been.

X

FEUDALISM AND THE CRUSADES

Sons too often bask in the reflected glory of great fathers: they all too rarely possess any other distinction. When Charlemagne died in 814 the great Empire fell apart—his cohesive genius alone had kept it together. His son, Louis the Debonnaire, had no strength to keep the Empire going, and soon lost the will to do so. He divided his realm among his three sons, Lothaire, Pepin, and Louis. Later on, when he wished to give a portion to a fourth son, Charles the Bald, the other three sons immediately resorted to arms. Unfortunately, the father's army abandoned him. To add to his troubles, the ecclesiastical authorities further humiliated him, and the authority of the emperor was undermined by the activity of the clergy. Before he passed away in 840 the political atmosphere was charged with contentious disagreements about succession; and the conditions of the times were complicated by ecclesiastical attempts to raise the power of the Church above that of the secular power. The brothers fell to quarreling among themselves concerning the division of the Empire, but at last resorted to arbitration. The arbitrators knew very little about the geographical boundaries of the Empire, and less about its internal condi-

tions. Squabbling began again, and preparations went forward for a resort to arms. But the condition of the poor, the scarcity of food, the rise of Saxon enemies, and a wholesome disgust at the quarrels of the kings at last moved the nobles to demand that the matter should be settled and peace restored. The arbitrators were sent throughout the Empire to acquaint themselves with the conditions and to map out suitable boundaries.

All met at Verdun, where a treaty was signed in 843. Lothaire received Italy, the Valley of the Rhine, and the title of Emperor; Charles got France, and Louis, Germany. The other son, Pepin, had died before his father had passed away. The treaty—like all such treaties—took little note of the interests of the people. Unsatisfactory as it was, it nevertheless set the boundaries to the kingdoms of France, Italy and Germany. Germany accepts the date of this treaty of Verdun as the beginning of her national existence.

During the two hundred years following this treaty, Europe passed through some of her saddest experiences. She was confronted by dangers within and enemies without; by turmoil, confusion, distress, and hideous havoc. The barbarian Northmen, in their periodic raids over Germany and France, threatened to destroy, at its birth, the beginnings of national life. From the South there rose a new Saracenic power, which

occupied Italy, while the Magyars begin their devastating occupation of the West. Such menaces demanded the strength and determination of a Charlemagne, but no one rose to take his place. The descendants of that great emperor had minds only for their petty interests, and the barbarians came on in irresistible waves. In order to offer some semblance of resistance, the kings had to call upon the nobles and dukes, who were not loth to take full advantage of the opportunity to strengthen their own position while rendering service to the State.

The most capable of all the kings was Louis the German. When the exasperated nobles of Charles the Fat—who was lazy and indolent—deposed him and elected his nephew Arnulf as his successor, a brave warrior had at last arrived. But in a short time the Carolingian dynasty had come to an end in Germany with the death of Arnulf's son (in 911), and it passed out a little later in France. In France, however, the powerful nobles and dukes had taken matters into their own hands, robbed the line of all power, and selected one of their own to rule the country. His name was Hugh Capet, and he was the founder of the Capetian line of the kings of France.

In the latter years of Charlemagne's reign, he had had the turbulent Saxons on his hands, and was also compelled to pay some attention to the incursions of the Northmen. These wild

men of the North—fearless, ardent lovers of the sea, courageous to the last degree—had formed the kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. But love of adventure was too strong within them to admit of their settling down to their kingdoms. Along the shores of the North Sea they went on foraging expeditions—up the Loire, down the Seine, up the Rhine. Whenever the spring sun loosened the ice on their northern rivers, down they came, burning, laying waste, wantonly ravaging and plundering. These were some of the most desperate days that Germany was ever to know. And France was to pass through the same experiences. Sailing up the Seine to Paris in 885, the Northmen laid siege to the city. The citizens fought and kept Paris out of the hands of its enemies for almost a year. Then they appealed to Charles the Fat, and after some delay he marched with his German army to the aid of the city. But when he arrived, he concluded a most insulting peace, as far as the French were concerned; he bought off the enemy with silver and gave them Burgundy to pillage. Large numbers of Northmen settled in what is now Normandy, were recognized as possessors of that part of France by treaty in 911, learned the language and customs of the French, and supported the French monarchy.

To pass over to Britain: The fair lands of England, after the departure of the Roman legions, were occupied by the Angles and Saxons.

They drove the Welsh into Cornwall and Wales, where, in the latter country, they were to maintain their Celtic ardor almost unimpaired down to the present hour. Some of the Celts, however, fled the land to make their home on a small piece of territory on the shores of western France, which they called French Britain. During the hilarious excursions of the Northmen, the latter exacted heavy tribute from the Anglo-Saxons, until they met their match in Alfred the Great (871-901). Many of these Northmen settled in western England, making it their permanent home, as they were to do in France.

During these centuries of disorder, when no strong king arose to set up a central government, dukes and nobles were compelled to undertake the duties of defense and of conquest. Theirs were the strong arms upon which the king relied for the preservation of his lands. Under such conditions it is easy to understand that the position of the nobles would be immensely strengthened while that of the kings would become subservient to theirs.

The system that arose out of these disorderly conditions was one which has always emerged under like conditions, whether in Egypt, Japan, China, or western Europe. Criticize the system of feudalism as much as we may, it nevertheless came into existence as the result of an inevitable tendency within society; and also as a means to meet a situation which could hardly

have been met in any other way. Feudalism is as old as the need that calls it into existence, and as ubiquitous as the conditions that make it inevitable. It is easy enough to criticize it from the point of view of the present; but it served its purpose. It was not called into existence by the malignant powers of the nobles, nor through the supineness of the great mass of the people. Great emergencies call for strong measures. In times of war we are willing to endure restrictions upon our liberty which we would rather die than endure in days of peace. Feudalism did not suddenly arise in Europe. Some of its principles go back to the Romans, some to the customs of the Germans; but its root ideas are to be found in the desire for protection, for self-preservation. What the people needed more than anything else was the strong hand of a protector against the rapacities of their own fellow nationals, their supposed rulers—and against their enemies. It was a demand for peace, peace at a price; and by forfeiting many of their rights they did gain protection, with the privilege of making a living, arduous tho their life had to be, and too often deadening in the monotony of its isolation. In its earliest phases men looked upon the system as eminently just, and if it was not wholly satisfactory, nevertheless, its approximation to their needs rendered them more or less content.

When the decline of feudalism comes we see

oppression, injustice, burdens placed upon the long-suffering poor, and the right of the sword supreme above every other right. Where the system had formerly found a place for almost everyone, where he could perform his duties and enjoy his rights, in the later times we see it passing into anarchy; while all over feudal Europe interminable wars are the order of the day. How strongly entrenched it had been may be noted in the fact of the persistence of many of its principles and ideas down to our own time. But let us see what the system was like.

Feudalism refers to the institutions erected in the Middle Age to regulate public and private life. It was a great social, economic, military, political, and also ecclesiastical system, operating to meet the several needs of the individual and of society. The entire system rested on the basis of land. According to the theory of the time, all lands belonged to God. The emperor or king held his land "by the Grace of God" and was answerable only to him for its administration. He was God's trustee. But the king had the right to make grants of land—fiefs or feuds, from which the word feudalism comes—to his followers. When such a grant was made, it was called a feudal tenure. A lord could also be a vassal of another lord by virtue of such a grant of land; and kings holding lands from other kings were also vassals to those kings.

When a grant was made to a lord, he had the

right to subdivide his land among other vassals on the same basis as that on which he had received it. A lord obtaining land from another had to go through the ceremony known as homage. Kneeling before the grantor, and placing his hands between the hands of the lord, he swore aloud that he would be his lord's man or *homme;* he would defend him to the limit of his life, would devote himself to him, and would render him such services as were necessary and stipulated. The vows having been made and accepted, the lord granted the lands by investiture, and by a symbolic affair such as a piece of sod taken from the lands granted, a stone, or any such object associated with the soil.

A vassal must never disclose his lord's secrets, and must immediately acquaint his lord with all information gained concerning his enemies. Should the lord be unseated in battle, the vassal must give his own horse to his lord. By counsel his lord must be advised, and in all circumstances his honor and reputation must be upheld. In times of need the vassal must proceed with his lord to battle; and, in proportion to the amount of land granted, must raise a certain number of men to serve for a stipulated period. The period might be sixty or forty or twenty days, which meant that the fighting could only go on near home. The vassal agreed to serve as a magistrate, and to assist the lord in the gov-

ernment of his domain and the maintenance of order.

Where the lord demanded such rights he was also compelled to observe duties, for the relation of rights and duties was reciprocal. The fief could not be arbitrarily taken back at will; protection must be given to the vassal, justice rendered, and a safeguard thrown about the vassal to enable him to enjoy the full rights and privileges of his fief or grant.

The lord, having received his grant of land from the king, must have it cultivated. This work was done by the working classes known as serfs. All the regulations described above pertained to the higher, noble classes, the fighting class in feudalism. But a somewhat similar system prevailed in the parceling out of the land by the lord to his working-class tenants; in this case, however, the grants were known as "servile tenures." The serfs paid for their land in labor, or in produce, giving a portion of their crops. Upon these the lord depended for his support, and in his relation to them he had duties to perform as well as rights to exact. Most of the lowest peasants were inalienably attached to the land, forever tied to the manor within which they were born.

It might be well for us to remember that in the palmy days of feudalism everything within the realm was more or less of a fief. It was a thoroughgoing system of concessions. It was the

most glorious of all days of "racketeering." The concessions included hunting privileges, community bake-shops, the right to ferry men across rivers, to act as guides on the roads, to become merchant-protectors—in fact, almost everything imaginable connected with the assistance of others or with an article of daily need. It was, theoretically at least, a tightly compacted socialistic scheme, top-heavy in its benefits in the direction of the lords, where every man had certain rights, and where a place was found for every man.

The Church itself had its place within the scheme. In times when every man's hand was raised against every other man, especially so in the days of the decline of feudalism; when there was no strong central government, no standing army, no organized and universally recognized authority, the Church was compelled to look after herself. Long before this she had gathered to herself, by bequests of the faithful and donations of various kinds, vast stores of wealth. In order to protect this wealth, and to maintain her rights, she must needs organize for herself a body of laymen who would protect, by the sword if need be, the property committed to their care. Many of these gentlemen, however, saw to it that these offices of protectorship became hereditary in their own families, and from this it was no long stride to appropriating the property as their own. The Church at length owned more

than one-fifth of all the land in England and France, and almost one-third in Germany. Kings might come and kings might go, distributing their lands as they went; but the Church was a continuing institution, and what she gained she held. Punishments inflicted by the king could only touch the person of the punished in this world; but by the infliction of excommunication the Church had an instrument that could reach beyond the grave, and few there were who dared to invite the use of that instrument against them.

While feudalism served its purpose in the strenuous days that called it into being, it nevertheless worked infinite hardships upon the poor, and ultimately produced a condition of anarchy without parallel in the history of Western Europe. When a noble was on the war-path he burned farms, destroyed fields of standing grain, drove cattle away to his own manor, and reduced people to a state of hopeless misery. Between the villain and the lord there was no voice but the voice of God. Free, common men had disappeared. The lord could do with them as he pleased; they were entirely at his disposal. He could put them in prison—rightly or wrongly—as often as he pleased, and had to render account of them to no one, except to God, and God too often appeared to be an absentee landlord who had delegated his rights of authority to the lords.

Feudalism at its best was a fine system—par-

ticularly so for the lords. At its worst it passes description. The sword was the final arbiter of all disputes; and disputes were as plentiful as the troubles of the poor. High in their castles, with the hovels of the poor clustered about them as chickens seeking shelter from the hawk; clothed in heavy mail, the lords thought of nothing but of battle—of preparing for it or of recovering from it. Ignorance was widespread, save in the quietude of the monasteries, where devoted servants of the Church kept aflame, as well as they could, the light of learning. Outside of the monasteries there was no thought for learning; the times were given up to the anarchy of war, and the common people paid the price. Lords could fight among themselves from sunrise to sunset, and leave upon the field but three of their own—as happened at Brenneville, where the kings of France and England fought a bloody battle. The nobles were amply protected in their coats of mail. Not so the poor; their bodies must pile up as the evidence of success or failure. The nights were aglow with fires of farms and crops, while the roads were infested with robbers. The Archbishop of Tyre describes the scenes of the day:

> There was no security for property. Were a man regarded as rich, this was sufficient excuse for throwing him into prison, keeping him in irons, and putting him to cruel torture. Sword-girded brigands infested the roads, lay in ambush and spared neither strangers nor men de-

voted to the service of God. Cities and fortified towns were not safe from such crimes. Cutthroats made the streets and squares dangerous for the wealthy man.

In addition to all these troubles, as tho to fill the cup of anguish to the brim, between 970 and 1040 there were forty years of terrible famine, and of raging pestilence.

Lest the reader should imagine that these centuries of war, pestilence, and famine meant a complete breakdown of civilization, with a consequent destruction of its forces, let us hasten to add that such was not the case. The lighter side of life also effervesced on occasion. Times were never so bad that people could not laugh, play games, and sport a little. Even the common people found relief from the benumbing uniformity of their lives by engaging in fool-play, and in staging crude farces for the nobles.

But, above everything else, the Church stood like a guardian angel over the deep things within men's spirits. The people might be tied to their small areas, but the Church, with its universal appeal, with its ritual and ceremonies, lifted men up out of their narrow boundaries into the ampler areas of human and eternal fellowship. The Church touched them "with a quickening inspiration and a permeating unity." She sought, by all means at her command, to give marriage a due sanctity even for the commonest man and woman in the realm. She kept

the embers of freedom burning by proclaiming in all seasons the equality of serf and lord and king in the eyes of God. She ever held aloft the rights of the intellect and of the heart, above the arbitrary and bloody rights of the sword. And within her sacred confines she preserved with marvelous fidelity the rich inheritance of the open mind. Amidst decay, anarchy, division, she spread the leaven of her teachings, a leaven which was to make the heaviness of the times lightness, the unpalatable palatable, and the spirit of man more powerful than the forces that sought to crush it down.

This leaven of the church was one of the forces operating in the direction of the final breakdown of the feudal system. Another was the gradual movement in the direction of a strong central authority; in other words, the rise of monarchy. It is the law of human nature that those who have power seek to enlarge its scope of operation. Some of the lords managed to subject the minor lords to their own will; and the great lord became the chief ruler of the kingdom. In other instances we see the princes throwing off the shackles of feudalism and stepping out into the freedom of their own rule; still others win by diplomacy, thus becoming acknowledged masters. Whichever method was employed, the end was the same, and monarchy began to rise above the arbitrary rule of num-

berless lords, to establish a strong central government.

Another force came to the aid of the distressed commoner in the invention of gunpowder. The lord in his mail could feel little injury in combat, so long as weapons were swords and arrows; against a rising of peasants, he could prevail, immune. But when peasant organizations began to be formed in Germany, and when gunpowder became one of their weapons the lord's stone castle was as useless for protection as were his steel mail and cumbersome helmet. Other causes of change also were at work. Some of the greatest forces bringing about the decay of feudalism emerged out of the tremendous body of influences emanating from the crusades.

During all the long years of disturbance in Europe, the Church had been quietly gathering strength and expanding the range of its influence. For many years the offices which normally were performed by the civil powers were forced upon the Church. If she did not, or could not, preserve some semblence of authority, there was no power in Europe that could. One of the greatest personalities in the Church was that of Pope Gregory VII (1073-85), more often remembered as Hildebrand. Formerly a monk of Cluny, he had risen to eminence by intellectual powers of a high order by surpassing courage, and by a whole-hearted devotion to the interests of the Church. Through his influence and leadership,

the clergy went everywhere preaching obedience; raising the moral standards of the people, as well as of the clergy, to new heights. Between such a dominant personality and the emperors there must needs come a clash. "The world," said Hildebrand, "is lighted by two lights: the sun the greater, and the moon the smaller; the apostolic authority resembles the sun, the royal power the moon. As the moon owes its rays to the sun, so emperors, kings and princes only exist by the grace of the pope because he is appointed by God. Everything then is subordinate to the pope."

The resulting clash of interests between these two powers of the Middle Age—the Papacy and the Empire—was a long-drawn-out affair. In the quarrel over investitures, both parties resorted to arms, and Henry IV—with a divided Germany on his hands—must needs stand penitent at the Castle of Canossa, imploring pardon through his tears. But this only served to add fuel to the fires and the order was reversed when Henry forced the pope to compromise and the Church's prestige to be lowered. In 1122, the Concordat of Worms settled the matter of investitures; in this treaty the emperor renounced his claim over ecclesiastical investitures, agreeing to render to the prelates the temporalities of their benefices. Other occasions of dispute between these two forces arose, but it was now admitted that temporal power had its source of authority in the

State, and that spiritual power resided solely in the Church.

In the midst of these struggles there came one of the most phenomenal movements Europe was ever to know—a widespread religious fervor, fanatical in some of its phases, noble in others. The crusades were as typically medieval, so far as their motives were concerned, as any feature of life in that epoch; but when their influences make themselves felt in Europe we see a definite transition from medieval to modern life.

Yet again in our story of civilization do we see West and East come into armed conflict. The Moslems had gained possession of the sacred places in and about Jerusalem. In its effort to rescue these places from the infidel, Europe almost tore itself from its foundations. Christendom hurled its power against the Moslems. For hundreds of years the pious within the Church had sought to make pilgrimages to the East, to bathe themselves in the Jordan, and to kneel at the tomb of Christ. As long as the Arabs were in control of the East, no disturbances arose, and the pilgrims found no great difficulty in satisfying their needs. But at the close of the tenth century the Seljuk Turks were in possession of Palestine and Syria, and the holy places were in their hands. Pilgrims returned with stories of harrowing experiences at the hands of the Turks: some were robbed, others were brutally ill-treated, others were killed. Western

Europe had cause to fear the brutal force of these Turks; Christians everywhere looked upon them as emissaries of Satan himself.

Gregory VII had brooded long over the possibility of sending an expeditionary force to rescue the Holy Sepulchre. But it was left to Pope Urban II, and to the fiery ardor of Peter the Hermit, to set the religious conflagration going. Peter had just returned from Asia, where he had witnessed outrages at the Holy Sepulchre. His burning indignation and his fiery eloquence set the crowds on the move with a gathering momentum of emotional fervor. At the Council of Clermont, in 1095, Pope Urban preached an impassioned sermon to a vast crowd of bishops, princes, knights, and people assembled in the open air to hear him. His eloquence was punctuated by the cry from the highly wrought crowd: "God wills it! God wills it!" All Europe went on fire. In the spring of 1096 the forty or fifty thousand French members of the First Crusade went forth for their Holy War. They were joined by a like number of Germans after crossing the Rhine, Charlemagne, it was believed, rising from his tomb to lead them. Scots and Frenchmen, Englishmen and Germans, Italians and barbarians, women and children, boys of all ages with the red cloth thrown over their shoulders denoting that they were crusaders, marched away to execute upon the abhorrent Turk the will of God—and were nearly all ex-

terminated by the Turk when they arrived on Turkish soil.

For two hundred years—with ebb and flow—the tramp of crusaders marching to the East resounded through Europe. The sufferings and tortures they endured no pen could describe. Motives were mixed and varied, as they naturally would be. The prisons were emptied of those who sought expiation for their crimes by joining the ranks of God's soldiers. Prince, noble, and knight thrilled to the great adventure; while many dreamed of large kingdoms which could be carved out of fair Eastern lands. But all in vain; the main objectives were never permanently realized; the Near East still lies under the rule of Islam.

During these years, and in these nine crusades, we may see examples of the noblest of human virtues; and we may also witness the basest depravities and the wildest passions let loose. If the objectives were never realized, what good did the Crusades do for Europe? Much, and in many ways. You cannot uproot hundreds of thousands of people from a narrow and restricted life to make them gaze upon a world infinitely more varied and beautiful than anything they ever dreamed of, without also liberating powers as refreshing, in their invigorating influence, as they are broadening in their discipline. Peoples of all classes and grades and nationalities were thrown together in democratic

simplicity. The higher culture of the East almost blinded the eyes of the West; and the superior mentality of the hitherto despised East wrought, first, humiliation, then emulation in the minds of the West. The arts and crafts and industries of the East found their way into the West.

The spark of Eastern genius had disturbed the Western clod, and the result was to be noted in the decay of feudalism, in the strengthening of monarchy, in the dissemination of new ideas, and in the rise of a new spirit of self-reliance. Commerce with the East took on a new significance. Demand increased for the products of the East; tastes were developed and indulged, that Europe had previously never known. Delicacies, ornaments, perfumes, precious stones, tapestries —where shall we close the list?—all find their way to a Europe that has awakened to realize its need of such things. Maritime commerce comes to birth. From Venice, Genoa, Pisa, the merchants go forth to trade, and the Mediterranean is coming to its own again. In the meantime towns within Europe have grown to such proportions as to hold increasingly larger populations, and more power. While the lords have gone down, the merchants and tradespeople have gone up, the higher areas of the common people are coming into their own.

During these times we note a great development in voluntary associations formed for the mutual aid and protection of their members.

These gilds were of various kinds—religious gilds, merchant gilds, craft gilds. The last-named were somewhat similar to our trade-unions, in that members of a particular trade joined together to aid and protect each other—a very natural tendency, especially in view of the fact that trade was rapidly expanding. These craft gilds wielded a great influence over their members, both from the standpoint of quality of workmanship and also from the standpoint of trade solidarity.

Gathering together the fruits of the period, we can see that European nations are now formed, and are beginning to express their characteristics. Feudalism is everywhere declining; its day of usefulness is over. Towns and cities are rising; art and architecture are beginning to be generally appreciated. Trade and commerce are expanding; national languages, and so national literatures, are formed. Europe is shaking off its slumbers, and girding itself for new adventures, more thrilling than the old; adventures into the unexploited regions of its own spiritual empire. The contributions of Greece and Rome, Palestine and Arabia, were all to be fused into the content of Europe's life; and out of that content our civilization was to emerge. But before that day comes, other days must intervene, and to these we pass.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

R. S. Lull, *The Ways of Life; The Evolution of the Earth.*

H. F. Osborn, *Men of the Old Stone Age; Origin and Evolution of Life.*

Breasted, *Ancient Times.*

Holderness, *Peoples and Problems of India.*

Brian Brown, *The Wisdom of the Chinese.*

Lynn Thorndike, *A Short History of Civilization.*

Wissler Clark, *Man and Culture.*

H. G. Wells, *The Outline of History.*

Somervell, *Critical Epochs in History.*

A. D. F. Hamlin, *History of Architecture.*

Sellery and Krey, *Medieval Foundations of Western Civilization.*

F. S. Marvin, editor, *The Unity of Western Civilization.*

R. W. Livingstone, editor, *The Legacy of Greece.*

OUTLINE OF HISTORY

PART II

THE
WORLD'S ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE

VOLUME I

OUTLINE OF HISTORY

PART II

By ALBERT SHEPPARD
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF GENERAL HISTORY, SCHOOL OF COMMERCE, ACCOUNTS AND FINANCE, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

and JOHN SEYBOLD MORRIS
LECTURER ON GENERAL HISTORY, SCHOOL OF COMMERCE, ACCOUNTS AND FINANCE, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK *and* LONDON

COPYRIGHT, 1929, BY
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
[Printed in the United States of America]

Copyright Under the Articles of the Copyright Convention
of the Pan-American Republics and the United States

CONTENTS

THE OUTLINE OF HISTORY—PART II

	PAGE
XI—Introduction to the Modern World	7
XII—The Cultural Renaissance	16
XIII—Geographical Discoveries, The Strong Monarchy, Colonization, and The Commercial Revolution	33
XIV—The Protestant Reformation	48
XV—The Catholic Reformation and the Wars of Religion	77
XVI—The Absolute Monarchy	92
XVII—The Intellectual Revolution	112
XVIII—The French Revolution and Napoleon	126
XIX—Nationality and Democracy	142
XX—The Industrial Revolution	156
XXI—America—The Colonial Period	168
XXII—The American Revolution	180
XXIII—The New Nationalism	190
XXIV—Civil War and Reconstruction	206
XXV—Modern America	216
XXVI—The World War	224
XXVII—Postlude	242
Bibliography	253

OUTLINE OF HISTORY

PART II

XI

INTRODUCTION TO THE MODERN WORLD

It can be said with some assurance that the European man of the Middle Age was in many aspects in a state of passive childhood parented by two institutions: Feudalism and the Roman Catholic Church. The Feudal System has already been described. It remains to be emphasized that it provided for man's physical needs; it gave food, shelter, and protection. Furthermore, so far as things material were concerned, each unit of the Feudal System was sufficient unto itself. Each manor maintained an isolated, self-supporting village community—producing the food, tools, and clothes needed by its occupants. There was nothing the medieval man needed to satisfy his body that could not be found within the manor's walls. And those who dwelt therein were not inclined to look beyond those walls.

Just as the manor provided for the physical wants of the European man of the Middle Age, the Roman Catholic Church took care of his

mental and spiritual needs. Preserving the structure of imperial Rome, cherishing in monopoly the knowledge and learning of the time, more powerful than any feudal baron, the Church in the Middle Age reached the height of its influence. Indeed it was the only organized force of its period. It provided education when no other agency was capable of doing so. The monastic libraries preserved and copied books—printing was an unborn art. Monasteries and cathedral schools were the only bulwarks against absolute illiteracy. The Church kept alive the Latin language, on which literature depended, and it made Latin the universal tongue.

In the realm of the spiritual the Church through the sacramental system quite literally led the medieval European from the cradle to the grave. And the spiritual realm had none of its modern limitations. To the Church all belonged, and the Church fulfilled many functions now partially or wholly secular. At birth the child was baptized by the Church. In youth it confirmed him. In manhood it married him. Throughout his life it forgave his sins. In the service of its mass it sustained him. And he passed to death with its blessing.

The faith of the Church in the Middle Age, accepted like the admonitions of a wholly trusted mother, bade man to take but little thought of this world and feast his eyes on the

world to come. And to the glories and joys of that world the Church held the only keys. What is more, the Church, under the leadership of the medieval schoolmen, buttressed its faith with the most complete and adequate philosophical system the world has ever witnessed. For once in the annals of man's wonderings, mind and soul accorded well.

Finally, the Church of the Middle Age achieved a scheme of society in which the efforts of the individual were completely subjected to the greater glory of the whole group. True in varied departments of life, this is no better exemplified than in the medieval Gothic cathedrals, impressive monuments of towering beauty to the greatest communal effort ever put forth by the brain and brawn of mortal men.

Small wonder, then, that the European man of the Middle Age exhibited the passiveness of contented childhood. The feudal manor nurtured his body. The Church sustained his mind and soul, and commanded him to forsake the joys of this world for the prophet's paradise to come. All earthly ambition was quelled. By thousands men renounced the worldly life and sought the seclusion of cloistered cells.

Feudalism and the Church, the twin guardians of medieval Europe, reached the height of their influence in the thirteenth century. From that time forward their complete dominion over the European man gradually lessens.

Until the middle of the fifteenth century the parental hands are firm, but weakening. The forces are almost unconsciously gathering which make of the childlike European a revolting youth.

Feudalism begins to decline. The causes of the decline are varied and complex. There evidently came a time when serfdom no longer paid. It was cheaper to hire labor. When the Black Death (1348-1349) reduced Europe's man-power by half, wages became higher. There is also the probability that the feudal baron needed payment in money rather than in products of the soil and services; perhaps the overlord needed money to compensate hired soldiery. At any rate it seemed wise to lease out land to a "middleman" for money rent. He, in turn, would use hired labor. The hired laborer was no longer strictly bound to the land. But, as in every phase of life, increased freedom brings increased responsibility. The childlike European was, by the necessity of his condition, learning self-dependence.

From the eleventh century forward there grew another movement which undermined feudalism and accentuated the independence of the medieval European: the rise of the towns. They rose with the growth of trade and manufacture —new forms of wealth. At first the towns were bound to the feudal lord on whose land they were situated. Later they won their freedom

from feudal obligations and for their citizens servile conditions ceased. Between nobles and peasants now arose this middle class, the burghers. Feudalism was dealt another blow. What is more, many towns later allied with the kings against the feudal barons. Increased numbers of the men of the Middle Age were caring for their individual physical needs. When gunpowder was invented they managed their own protection.

And in almost the same period the passive European man began to break his mental and spiritual as well as his physical bonds. Not for a long time was there widespread open revolt, but in the fourteenth and earlier centuries there were those first forebodings of restlessness and discontent under the Church's unquestioned authority. Abelard, the founder of the University of Paris, was condemned for heresy in 1122. From around 1170, the followers of Peter Waldo in Lyons rejected the sacramental system. John Wyclif in England during the fourteenth century translated the Bible, proposed that the State should confiscate the property of the clergy, and attacked the central miracle of the Church, transubstantiation—the changing of bread and wine into body and blood. The Hussites in Bohemia, after their leader was burned, were granted the right to communion in both kinds and represented the first sect within the Church. Not least of all historical thinkers

was the thirteenth-century Roger Bacon, who by his insistence on scientific experiment began the still-persistent questioning of all authority.

The papacy, too, by the thirteenth century had reached the height of its influence. Then it was that the successors of St. Peter sought to extend to the full the prerogative given to the great fisherman-disciple; the popes, notably Innocent III and Boniface VIII, asserted that theirs was the power on this earth to bind and loose not only things spiritual but also things temporal. And even the Holy Roman Emperor dared not say them nay.

Early in the following century both England and France challenged this supremacy. The latter nation even took the Holy Father prisoner, an action which hastened his death and evoked from the poet Dante the taunt: "Christ had been again crucified among the robbers." There followed the Babylonian Captivity—1309-1376—when the popes were mere vassals of the French kings. Then came the "Great Schism," when rival popes ruled in Rome and Avignon. All this detracted from the prestige of Mother Church.

But the hold of the Church on man's spiritual and mental life was beginning to be lessened not so much by specific revolts as by a slow and subtle but fundamental change in the attitude of the people. Men grew restless and wondered. They were commencing to be a bit dissatisfied

with just the anticipation of the world to come; they grew curious about and eager for the things of this world. For this change the Church itself was not without responsibility. Throngs had followed the Cross in the Crusades. They had seen all the luxuries of the East and longed to taste of them. Friar John and Marco Polo had traveled to the Orient and brought back reports of not unattractive worldliness. The merchants, too, contacted with the East. The childlike European was having the curiosity of youth aroused.

There was more. Universities arose. National literatures had their beginnings, and significant beginnings some of them were: in Italy there was Dante's *Divine Comedy;* in England Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales,* and Wyclif's Bible.

It was also in the fourteenth century that Petrarch the lyric poet spread his enthusiasm for the works of classical writers. Men began collecting Greek and Latin manuscripts, and in so doing they recaptured some of that spirit of inquiry which would soon move them to ask questions of great consequence: "What of the world in which we are living?" "Whence is authority derived?"

Furthermore, the rise of the towns hastened this slow intellectual expansion in the late Middle Age. Where men congregated in numbers, where they felt for the first time the freedom from the bonds of feudalism, where individual

and communal problems demanded solution, where opportunity was offered for discussion between man and man—there arose questionings the answering of which might upset any rigid system of thinking or living.

Thus slowly, almost imperceptibly, but none the less surely, the European man began to put away childish things, to relinquish his contentment in the care of Feudalism and the Church. Modern Europe, so called, did not then come suddenly. Many historians—for reasons chiefly of convenience—date it from 1453. And in that year an event occurred which undoubtedly gave it tremendous impetus. The Turks under Mohammed II captured Constantinople, last stronghold of the Byzantine Empire.

As a result the northern land-routes to the East came under the control of the Turks. This gave temporary triumph to the city of Venice, which controlled a route by Alexandria and the Red Sea—the Turks didn't overrun Egypt until 1517. As a result of this loss of their lucrative trade with the East the Italian towns entered upon a long period of decline, from which they did not emerge until the nineteenth century. Portuguese and Spanish navigators were stimulated to search for an all-water route to the Indies. More than curiosity prompted Columbus, and it was no accident that he sailed for Ferdinand and Isabella instead of for his native town, Genoa.

Constantinople, moreover, had been a center of learning. When it fell, classical scholars fled with their manuscripts to western Europe. The influence of the culture they brought was not long unfelt. Paradoxically, the medieval man was discontented with the present when he learned of the past.

With the fall of Constantinople the Middle Age seems definitely to have passed into history. Judgment upon it must not be pronounced hurriedly. The vitality and the vigor, the freshness of modern times it lacked; it also achieved a beautiful serenity which the western world has not since enjoyed. There are those, and not a few, who label the thirteenth "the greatest of centuries."

And now, for better or for worse, the European man passes from serene and satisfied childhood to daring, sometimes foolhardy, youth. The bonds of authority are broken, the fledgling has left the nest to fly full-blown into a new phase of the history of western Europe—starting with what is called, inappropriately perhaps, a rebirth or Renaissance.

XII

THE CULTURAL RENAISSANCE

History is a continuous stream—not a succession of sharply separated eras. Nevertheless, for purposes of clear study we arbitrarily cut into that stream at a particular point or curve, and say, Here begins a new period. Even the broad divisions of history—ancient, medieval, and modern—are not at all clear-cut divisions. Yet for the sake of convenience and clarity we identify these periods by beginning and ending them at specific times, the exact dates of significant, concrete happenings, which, after all, are only milestones not reached by leaps and bounds but by the slow march of generations.

For purposes of convenience only, then, can we say that the Age of the Renaissance began with the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and ended with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. Many of the forces which brought it about were marshaled before 1453; many of the characteristics of the age persist after 1648. Even the name Renaissance fits only in a narrow sense; it was not so much a rebirth as a new birth; it was a rebirth only in that its fundamental spirit found confirmation in a revived culture of the past.

It has been said that the Renaissance consists

of three great discoveries: the discovery of man by himself, the discovery of the past, and the discovery of the world. And yet all these discoveries took place somewhat simultaneously, and they were interacting. The European man gradually—as if crossing from childhood to youth—broke with authority and found himself aware of new capacities of self-expression, new possibilities of enjoyment, assuming a new importance as an individual. He is no longer just a unit in a group. For this spirit of free and enlarged and intensified individualism he found a parallel and confirmation in the lives of the ancients revealed in classical works; the European man discovered the past because he began to feel himself at home in it. Both stimulating and stimulated by the new exuberance, this sense of his own new powers, was man's discovery of the world, evidenced in the Renaissance chiefly by geographical explorations and opening of new routes of trade, but also by the beginnings of exploration into the world of nature and the finding of the laws which governed that world.

We may perhaps best understand these three great discoveries of man if we divide the Age of the Renaissance into several large phases: the economic Renaissance, the Renaissance of culture, the geographical discoveries and colonization, the Commercial Revolution, and the two Reformations. These phases represent constantly

interacting forces separated here only for the sake of analysis and the gaining of a unified view of this tremendous movement.

The economic Renaissance and the Renaissance of culture may be well considered somewhat together; the former was a natural preface to the latter. Before Michelangelo came the Medici.

We have noted briefly the decay of feudalism and the rise of the towns. By the middle of the fifteenth century, owing to a great many causes, numbers of the towns had progressed a great way. Many of them had successfully overcome feudal influence and either allied with monarchs or become free cities. Other groups had organized themselves into powerful commercial leagues. The towns became wealthy and constituted a powerful factor in Renaissance life.

Leading all others in their progressiveness were the Italian towns. Feudal opposition was weakest in Italy, and Italy, too, occupied a geographical position particularly advantageous to the activities of the towns. Consider her place in the fifteenth-century world. She controlled the Mediterranean, then necessarily the center of trade. West and north of Italy were the crude but rising Spanish, French, English, and German territories. To the east lay the Byzantine Empire and the dominion of the Arabs.

Broadly speaking, the East had an abundance of the luxuries of life and the West an abun-

dance of certain necessities; and the Italian merchants quite naturally became the middlemen of Europe. The Crusades had aroused in many backward Europeans the taste for oriental luxuries. The Italian coastal cities, with Genoa, Pisa, and Venice in the leadership, pushed their galleys to the east, Alexandria, Jaffa, and Constantinople, and came back with ivory, gold, silks, dyes, spices, and slaves. Caravans hauled them over the Alps to western Europe. Sometimes, as their skill in navigation increased, the Italians sailed their galleys past Gibraltar on an all-water route to cities on the North Sea.

Such splendrous wares excited the crude Europeans hardly less than the gold of the explorers aroused the desires of the North American Indian. Gladly did the natives in France, Germany, and even England exchange their scarce coins, their linen, wool, furs, and leather for these glittering oriental goods. Back to the Levant with these staples sped the Italian galleys; the circle of exchange was complete. Modern commerce was born; commercial regulations came into being; roads were built. The Italian cities set up banks, started currency reforms.

Growing trade also changed the towns of the West. If they wanted oriental luxuries they must give in exchange goods of their own. Raw materials would not do; they cost too much to transport. Hence there arose side by side with the already-established merchant gilds the craft

gilds with their workers in linen, leather, furs, and other commodities. So powerful did the gilds become that they often controlled the towns economically, socially, and governmentally. At strategic points all over Europe towns developed with the new trade.

But the increase of export trade marked the end of the dominance of gild control. The sending of a galley fleet to the Levant demanded individual initiative and enterprise free from the minute rules and regulations of the gilds. The individual business genius arose, who took great risks but made fabulous profits. The capitalist was born.

Combination, in the form of the merchant company—a group undertaking enterprises too large for the individual capitalist—was also born. Many of these combinations—since blood is thicker than water—were made up of members of the same family. These combinations engaged also in financial operations, particularly banking. Such operations reached in Italy great proportions. Florence, like New York City to-day, became the banking center of the world. The House of Medici in that flourishing city, by the time Constantinople fell before Mohammed II, operated branch banks in every important commercial city of Europe. And the Medici gradually controlled Florence.

More than any other city, too, Florence was the center of that great Renaissance of learning

and culture which, starting in Italy, radiated its life-giving influences over the length and breadth of Europe. To the furtherance of the new culture, the new life, indeed, the Medici and their ilk lent the strength of their genius and money-power.

The occurrence in Italy of this rebirth of culture and learning can be ascribed to no particular cause. Feudalism was weakest there. Italy was nearest the Orient. Towns rose there more quickly, became more powerful. Greek scholars from the East filtered in. When the Byzantine capital fell in 1453 there was an influx of these learned men from the East. Petrarch, the first of the neo-classicists, was an Italian. But all these explanations leave still mysterious the wondrous flowering of life—gay, artistic, bubbling, joyous, sophisticated and sometimes cruel, but free—which took place in those Italian cities of the fifteenth century.

The Italian revival of learning at once eloquently exemplified both man's discovery of himself and his discovery of the past. The Middle Age had placed but small premium on the individual self and individual expression. Each human unit was subjected to the whole. The focus of attention on the world to come had involved denial of self in this sphere. The strong arm of authority exercised by the Church stimulated no individual initiative. The accomplishments of the Middle Age were communal.

To the Italian cities had now come wealth. They were close to the luxuriant East, which knew not self-denial. There came a new sense of power, a heightened pulse-beat. There was joy in living one's life. Capitalism emphasized individual accomplishment. The vision of the world to come dimmed; a new and nearer vision of the possibilities of this life took its place. The individual assumed an importance unequaled since the Age of Pericles. "Whenever you draw close enough to a Renaissance situation to see what is really happening," says Mr. Ferdinand Schevill, "you discover that the men who figure as leaders in the field under examination are liberating themselves from the fetters of the past and aiming at fuller self-expression. Philosophically stated, the Renaissance is therefore an age of emerging individualism, the essence of which is freedom."[1]

Emphasizing Renaissance worldliness in contrast to Middle-Age otherworldliness, Mr. John Herman Randall, Jr., maintains that the foundation of the new spirit was "an increasing interest in human life as it can be lived upon earth, within the bourne of time and space, and without necessary reference to any other destiny in the beyond or hereafter. . . . It meant that when society offered more than a rude mining-camp existence of blood and toil, the monastic temper declined, and gave way to a new and

[1] *A History of Europe* (Harcourt, Brace), 1925, p. 49.

vital perception of the dignity of man, of the sweetness and glory of being a rational animal.''[2]

Fired by ideals of liberty and individualism, it is not surprizing that the men of the Renaissance period, particularly in Italy, turned to whatever sources they could to confirm and enlarge those ideals. The literatures of Greece and Rome were an inexhaustible storehouse; only when they felt the same stirrings and passions known of old could the Renaissance students grasp the real content of these rich heritages. To quote Mr. Randall again:

> It happened that those who felt the call of human experience had a great literature to which they could turn, a literature written by peoples who had been stirred by the same passion for the free life of man in its natural setting. . . . But if the manuscripts of Greece and Rome had perished every one beneath the monk's missal, the outcome would not have been essentially different.[3]

Man had discovered himself. Looking backward he found in the records they had left a civilization of men who also had known ''the happy, natural, and wholesome enjoyment of the goods of human life in a refined civilization.'' The man of the Renaissance had discovered his past, his spiritual ancestry.

[2] *The Making of the Modern Mind* (Houghton Mifflin), 1926, pp. 114-115.
[3] *Ibid.*, 1926, p. 115.

The part played by Petrarch (1304-1374) in the Renaissance discovery of the past we have already mentioned. In espousing a reform of the curriculum of the schools he urged that Latin be studied not just as a dead language, the medium of theological disputes, but as a means towards the comprehension and the recreation of the full, genial, and comparatively happy outlook on life set forth in Latin literature. He used the word *humanitas* in its broadest connotation. Petrarch has been called the father of humanism, the first modern man. And he was the first of the group of collectors who spent their live-unearthing the now-treasured classical manuscripts. Among his confrères in this notable effort were Aurispa, who found texts of Sophocles and Æschylus, and Poggio Bracciolini, who recovered works of Cicero, Tacitus, and Livy.

Humanism, this movement to recover the genial spirit of the ancients, found, as the sixteenth century opened, its most brilliant exponent in the remarkable scholar and reformer, Desiderius Erasmus. Born in Rotterdam on the lower Rhine in 1467, he became ere his three-score years and ten were finished a resident of every country in Europe. He was in truth a citizen of the world, whose brilliant cosmopolitan spirit was broadened and deepened by scholarly delving into the realms of the past. Erasmus's most notable contribution to scholarship was a Greek New Testament with Latin translation made in 1516,

which discredited the Church's Vulgate version of the Bible. His *Praise of Folly* merrily lashed what he held to be the materialism and hollow traditions of the Renaissance Church which he hoped to reform. His activities in that direction belong to the history of the Reformation.

Suffice it to say that the names of Petrarch and Erasmus must be writ at the head of that honorable roll of humanists who vitalized the Renaissance by leading men back to the past.

And what did it yield, this twin discovery by man of himself and his past? What was the contribution of the Renaissance? Consider the flowering of art and literature in but a single Italian city, Florence. To literature it gave those great giants: Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio; and to the fine arts such names as Giotto, Ghiberti, Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Botticelli, and Cellini.

What geniuses they were! What myriad-minded men!

Michelangelo (1475-1564) was by preference a sculptor, and his chisel has left such monumental works as his *Moses* in Rome and the figures on the tombs of the Medici in Florence. Michelangelo was a painter, not of his own will, but at the command of a pope. His scenes of creation achieved with a brush on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel are still one of the richest artistic treasures of the Church. Michelangelo was an architect; in witness whereof let it only

be said that he designed and built the dome of St. Peter's.

Side by side with Michelangelo on the Renaissance canvas stands Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), painter, sculptor, architect, poet, musician, anatomist, botanist, and physicist. The *Last Supper* and the *Mona Lisa* have made Leonardo as universally appreciated as he was himself universally-minded. The airplane is among the most modern of inventions, yet not a few of the principles of aerodynamics are to be found in the notebooks, almost five centuries old, of this Florentine artist.

Benvenuto Cellini (1500-1571), master of all sorts of metal working, whose autobiography furnishes an unexcelled picture of the fullness, the gaiety, the abandon—and the cruelty—of Renaissance life, is another of the Florentine galaxy. Which of the great nations and empires of the modern world, we may ask, can rival this single city of Florence in its contributions to the fine arts? And Florence had by no means a monopoly on the Italian Renaissance. From Urbino, a mountain town, came Raphael, whose madonnas still charm a world. Venice, too, did not lag behind; she gave Giorgione, Paul Veronese, Tintoretto, Titian, and Bellini.

For the Renaissance this flourishing of Italian art has especial significance, for art, too, broke away from tradition and literally took on new life. The works of these immortals had a style

of their own, the Renaissance style. Of it Mr Ferdinand Schevill writes:

> Defining that style by its elements, we may . . . say first, that it represented a revival of classical forms; second, that it was inspired with the freshness of nature; and third, that, while by no means wholly emancipated from religion and the Church, it served the interest and outlook of energetic groups which had risen to influence through the opportunities of trade and industry.[4]

In art as in life man was discovering himself, his past, and in nature something of the world. And over the Alps there was, as in Italy, a similar flowering of the spirit, and painting showed the same realism and vitality. We can but mention in passing the names of Albrecht Dürer and Hans Holbein in sixteenth-century Germany, Franz Hals and Rembrandt in seventeenth-century Holland, and Rubens and Van Dyck in the southern Netherlands at the same period.

Literature, while not as flourishing as painting and other fine arts during the earlier Renaissance, made great strides even in Italy. We have referred to Benvenuto Cellini, the metal worker. But his immortality is equally assured by his autobiography. Of more political than literary significance is *The Prince* of Niccolo Machiavelli, a manual of the theory and prac-

[4] *A History of Europe* (Harcourt, Brace), 1925, p. 39.

tise of despotism and of the doctrine of expediency.

But across the Alps literature reached great heights. The extreme riotousness and abandon of the period finds its great champion in the Frenchman, Rabelais (1483-1553), whose laughter and satire found supreme expression in his *Gargantua,* a merry tirade against the old system of thought and education. Another Frenchman, Montaigne (1533-1592), the father of the essay, espoused a spirit of toleration.

And in the British Isles literature flourished as never before or since. The literary Renaissance in England probably received its impetus when around the opening of the sixteenth century the great humanist, Erasmus, visited there and left his impression chiefly on John Colet and Sir Thomas More. Colet, an eloquent preacher, founded St. Paul's school, where Latin and Greek and the Christian studies were presented in a new and vital fashion. More crowned his work with a single volume, *Utopia,* criticizing the order of the day and limning an ideal commonwealth where men would be equal, peaceful, and above all, happy.

The true literary Renaissance, however, came in the spacious times of great Elizabeth, an era which gave us Christopher Marlowe, Ben Jonson, Webster, Beaumont and Fletcher, and the majestic Shakespeare. Of Shakespeare's place

in the Renaissance Mr. Sidney Dark makes admirable estimate:

> If the Renaissance was a definite revolt against dogmatic condemnations, then Shakespeare was its supreme victor. Shakespeare was too experienced to condemn, too interested not to be eager to find explanations for villainy as well as for virtue. He had the typical Renaissance contempt for asceticism and the ascetic life, a contempt expressed in the beautiful line in which he speaks of cloistered sisters "Chanting faint hymns to the cold fruitless moon." [5]

And again:

> In Shakespeare one finds a reflection of nearly all the outstanding figures of his century. He had the love of color and splendor that characterized the Medici and the Italian painters. His laugh, "broad as ten thousand beeves at pasture," as George Meredith described it, reminds one of Rabelais. His tolerance, his sympathetic understanding of men of all kinds and all opinions, and particularly the disillusionment so evident in his later work, all suggest comparison with Montaigne.[6]

But the Renaissance of Learning was not only a forward movement in literature and the fine arts; there were almost equally revolutionary advances in science and invention. Again, man was discovering not only himself and his past, but something about the natural world in which he lived.

[5] *The Story of the Renaissance* (Doran), 1925, p. 102.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

Highly important were the physiological and anatomical discoveries of Dr. Vesalius, who in 1543 revolutionized anatomy; of Ambroise Paré in surgery; of William Harvey, who in 1628 announced his theory of the circulation of the blood; and of a list of other devoted scientists. But the most notable scientific achievements of the Renaissance were those in the realm of physics, mathematics, and astronomy, which led to the rise of the scientific method.

Copernicus (1473-1543) it was who, as every high-school lad has studied, discovered that the earth was but a single, not-too-large planet in the universe; that with other planets it revolved around the sun; and that it spun every twenty-four hours around its own axis. This discovery was a great shock; the medieval theory upheld the somewhat egotistical view that the earth was the center of the universe. Copernicus knew the radical nature of his discovery; his views were not published until a year after his death, and as late as 1600 Bruno was burned at the stake for championing them. The Copernican theory, as it soon came to be called, aroused widespread interest and curiosity and led to an intense development of mathematics.

Kepler's laws of planetary motion and Galileo's formulation of the laws of falling bodies, together with Francis Bacon's *Novum Organum* and Descartes's modern philosophy, are significant because each is a milestone on the road to

the use of the "scientific method," which, exactly contrary to Aristotle and the medieval schoolmen, demands that conclusions be reached only after careful observation of all the necessary phenomena involved in a particular situation. After numbers of units have been examined, some new truth may be induced. The Renaissance scientists never said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident."

More revolutionary in its immediate effects than any of the purely scientific discoveries was the series of inventions which led to the beginnings of modern printing. Before the Renaissance all books were made by the laborious work of copyists. Each copy required the same labor as the original, and parchment was costly. Most important were the inventions of paper and movable type. In 1454, the year after the fall of Constantinople, the first book was printed from movable type, and it was a version of the Bible. Thenceforward books multiplied. Knowledge, once the virtual monopoly of the Church, was rendered accessible to thousands. Reformers and innovators now had at their command the fundamental and most powerful instrument of propaganda—the printing press. Its effects were soon felt. Man's three great discoveries—himself, his past, and the world—were given tremendous impetus.

One other group of scientific advances must be considered in the Renaissance of learning: those

in geography and navigation. Geographical knowledge began to increase by no deliberate effort; rather the increase was a by-product of the search of sailor-merchants for markets and new routes of trade. Marco Polo, too, left an account of his perilous journey to the Far East, which stimulated imagination. In the fifteenth century maps were made as much to add to man's knowledge as to give practical information to mariners. Then, too, the broad discovery of the past led to the rediscovery of Greek ideas on geography, particularly the Ptolemaic teachings which held that the earth was not flat but round. Add to these the more extensive use of the astrolabe, a device for determining latitude; the compass, and the construction of larger and stronger sailing vessels, and it becomes quite evident that the time was ripe for the great voyages of discovery. Man's self and his past have been discovered; now, the world! The once passive, childlike European soon becomes an adventurous youth.

XIII

GEOGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES, THE STRONG MONARCHY, COLONIZATION, AND THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

At least two other factors in addition to particular advances in science are responsible for the geographical discoveries which took place in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. These factors are the rise of nationalities with new commercial possibilities, and man's desire for self-expression and adventure which was a part of the Renaissance spirit of exuberant youth in western Europe. There is still another impetus, minor perhaps, which cannot be overlooked, especially when discoveries resulted in new colonies: namely, the religious motive, the European's desire to convert the heathen and uphold the Christ.

The start in the succession of great discoveries was made by Portugal, a little country on the western edge of the Spanish peninsula. Two circumstances lent impetus to the Portuguese discoveries: Portugal did not share in the profits of the spice trade in which the Italian towns led, and Portugal lay opposite the continent of Africa, the west coast of which was inhabited by Mohammedan Moors who constantly interfered with Portuguese trade. Prince Henry the Navi-

gator (1394-1460), of Portuguese royal blood, purposed reaching the East Indies, source of spices, by sailing around the African continent. His expeditions reached west to the Azores and south to the Cape Verde Islands and almost to the equator. In 1486 Vasco de Gama found the new route and reached Calicut in Hindustan. The opening of the all-water route sounded the knell of the commercial supremacy of the Italian cities and of the Mediterranean.

The Portuguese were pioneers. Their success led others to try, just as in our own day one triumph in aviation leads others to new ventures. Discovery, the finding of new routes to the Indies, became the vogue of late-fifteenth-century Europe.

An outstanding triumph, tho he never knew its real significance, was scored by Christopher Columbus, native of Genoa, whose expedition was fitted out by Isabella of Castile. This hardy sailor, intrigued by the Ptolemaic theory that the earth was round, believed he could reach the Indies by sailing straight west. What he did is well known. On October 12, 1492, he reached the West Indies. He thought he had reached the already known East Indies. Fame came quickly. Three subsequent voyages never revealed that he had reached, not the outskirts of Asia, but a new continent. Fame passed quickly. He died almost in disgrace, and, ironically, the continent he unknowingly but definitely discovered

bears the name of another—Amerigo Vespucci.

In 1497 John Cabot, a Venetian hired by Henry VII of England, reached Breton Island off the North American coast. Other discoverers penetrated the new land until it became apparent that it was neither Asia nor the East Indies, but a new continent, a view confirmed in a three-year expedition from 1519 to 1522, on which Magellan, a Portuguese in Spanish service, and his companions rounded the world. (Magellan himself was killed in the Philippine Islands.)

One important phenomenon is to be noted regarding the geographical discoveries and the great colonizing undertakings which resulted from them: both discovery and colonization were successfully carried on largely by those national groups which had by the end of the fifteenth century developed into relatively strong monarchies. Discovery and colonization were assured by the support of a strong home government. And the strong monarchy, triumphant by one means or another over the decentralized feudal system, was one of the chiefest developments of the Renaissance.

All over Europe the rise of the towns had been a great boon to the power of the king. Under the feudal system the king had been among the great feudal barons simply the first among equals. The growth of towns and cities changed this. The king naturally wished to assert his supe-

riority in fact as well as in name; he had to gain sufficient power to lower the great feudal barons to a secondary position. They were the obstacle to be overcome. Feudal barons, too, were an obstacle for the growing towns and their citizens, who did not wish to pay feudal dues. Traders and merchants wished to be free from outside influences. It was natural then that the king should ally with the towns against feudal barons. The king got money and support from the towns; the towns received charters of privileges from the king and admission to the feudal assembly.

It is significant that Germany and Italy, where nationalism did not develop, had no part in the subsequent colonization efforts. Both these countries during the Middle Age were under the rule of the Holy Roman Emperor. In Germany a landed nobility and in Italy powerful independent towns militated against him. It was not until the nineteenth century that these two countries ceased to be mere geographic expressions and became united under powerful central governments.

In the countries where the monarchy waxed in strength, particular forces—in addition to the alliance between the king and the towns—aided the movement. And these countries initiated the discoveries and reaped their harvest.

Portugal was unified territorially by 1263. A line of able kings and the stimulus of a foe—the

Mohammedan—to be vanquished had undoubtedly aided the process of union. Portugal was the first of European states to gather the fruits of discovery, and altho overcome by Spain in 1580, she regained her independence in 1640.

At the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries Spain made great strides toward the establishment of a strong monarchy. Nothing did more to make this possible than the marriage, happy both personally and politically, of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile. Ferdinand was an able ruler. He secured in 1504 from France recognition of Spanish rights in Naples, Sardinia, and Sicily. Spain, too, faced the Mohammedan foe. Granada, the last Mohammedan stronghold, fell in 1492, the year of Columbus's first voyage. Successful voyages, of course, while made possible by the support of strong monarchy, in turn added prestige to the monarchy whence they emanated.

Altho England did not fare so well territorially in the Hundred Years' War, which ended in 1453—she lost all her rich French provinces save the town of Calais—there occurred almost immediately afterward an internal struggle, the Wars of the Roses (1455-1485), which did much to hasten the establishment of the strong monarchy in the island kingdom. The Wars of the Roses were a series of combats among rival claimants to the throne. When

Henry VII, first of the great Tudor monarchs, finally triumphed, it meant the beginning of absolutism in England. And at that time the English people welcomed it, for the Wars of the Roses had been so destructive to the common people that they accepted readily any innovation which promised peace and security; the Tudor monarchy promised to be that force. Henry VII's aim to create a strong monarchy was further facilitated by the fact that the Wars of the Roses had virtually wiped out many noble families; he could seize their lands, strengthen his position, and increase his wealth.

While the Hundred Years' War lessened England's hold on the Continent, it served to strengthen, unify, and solidify France under a strong monarchy. There was an awakened sense of patriotism. Louis XI (1461-1483) crushed the power of the barons; his son, Charles VIII (1483-1498) married Anne of Brittany and that duchy was brought under the French crown. This same Charles VIII started France on her century-long struggle for European hegemony.

Several other developments, more or less common to all the growing monarchies, aided the king in the increase of his power. There was the emotional element of nationalism, a feeling, a loyalty, based on a community of interests social, economic, and linguistic. Nationalism, beginning and developing at this period, rises with unfailing crescendo until the late World War—

and still continues. At the beginning of the sixteenth century this sentiment worked towards the enhancement of the king. Local loyalties, particularly in the towns, widened and came to include those who spoke the same language and had the same customs. The loyalty gradually grew into love of country. The personification of the country or nation came to be the king—ultimately most loyalties must have a personal or personified object.

The trend towards increased monarchical power was buttressed by the works of certain political observers and critics of the time. *The Prince* of Niccolo Machiavelli, written in 1513, was an apologia for absolutism and even tyranny. *The Leviathan* of Thomas Hobbes, altho it appeared almost a century and a half later, was almost a full-fledged acceptance of the necessity of absolutism to avoid "perpetuell warre of every man against his neighbour."

The kings were not slow to take advantage of these new influences. National assemblies—the Cortes in Spain and Portugal, the Estates-General in France, and to a lesser degree the English Parliament—waned in power. The king became the head of the country's judicial system. Crown officers began to replace feudal officials in collection of taxes, in preservation of the peace, and in administration of justice. And the king began to build his own armed force. The point especially to be remembered at this junc-

ture is that in the geographical discoveries, the efforts at colonization which followed, and the resulting expansion and change in commerce and trade which revolutionized the world, nay almost made a new world—in all these advances it was the strong monarchies which took the lead and reaped both the profits and the problems. The colonization and territorial expansion movement followed fast upon the heels of the discoveries.

Vasco de Gama returned to Lisbon from Calicut with a cargo valued at sixty times the cost of his expedition. The Portuguese had found an all-water and paying route to the Indies. Portuguese fleets regularly rounded the Cape of Good Hope. Goa was made the capital of extensive Portuguese possessions in the East which included Ormus and Muscat, Madras, Ceylon, the Spice Islands, Java, Sumatra, Celebes, and Borneo. In addition, they possessed Brazil and trading posts on the coast of Africa. They began trade with China in 1517 and Japan in 1542. Portugal replaced the Arab trading empire, and Lisbon became the trading depot for the coveted eastern commodities. Portugal made no effort to colonize; the Portuguese merely set up trading posts. Her dominion over half the world—all Africa, her Eastern possessions, and Brazil—did not last for long. She had neither the population nor the resources to provide products of her own for Eastern shipment, nor had she the power to defend her carrying trade. Hence, most

of the Portuguese possessions were lost to the Dutch in the seventeenth century. (It should be remembered that Portugal was under Spanish rule from 1580 to 1640.) Brazil became independent in 1822.

When Columbus made his famous voyage, Spain immediately claimed the right to share the world with Portugal. Pope Alexander VI intervened and drew the famous "papal line of demarcation" on May 4, 1493. The imaginary line was drawn from pole to pole, 100 leagues west of the Azores. It was shortly changed to 370 leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands. All the uncivilized world east of the line went to Portugal; all west to Spain.

The Spanish Empire was built largely by the Conquistadores, a colorful group of men who searched for ideal cities and fountains of perpetual youth. Ponce de Leon discovered Florida in 1512; Cortez defeated the Aztecs and conquered Mexico in 1519; Pizarro defeated the Incas and conquered Peru in 1531. The Spanish Empire ultimately included the West Indies (Haiti, Cuba, Porto Rico, Jamaica, etc.); Florida, New Mexico, Central America, and all South America save Portuguese Brazil; and the Philippines.

The Spanish colonies were at first disappointing. They yielded no spices, no silks, and scarcely any gold, but the disappointment was not for long. There was some gold and silver in Mexico

and still more in Peru. And there was sugar, a new commodity, in the West Indies. In 1580, it is to be remembered, Spain conquered Portugal, and the East and Brazil became Spain's. Small wonder that the Spanish Empire dazzled Europe almost to the close of the sixteenth century!

Maladministration at home and abroad in the course of time sounded the death knell to this magnificent monopoly of trade and commerce. Philip II of Spain was the ruler who bore the brunt of his own shortsightedness. Cruelty and enslaved labor in the Peruvian and Mexican silver mines reduced alarmingly the native population there. There was at first no attempt to develop agriculture and industry—necessary fundamentals—in the colonies. Exorbitant taxes were levied on trade with the colonies; commerce with America was grabbed by smugglers, chiefly English and Dutch. Heavy property taxes at home, the driving out of Jews and Moors, who had been the enterprising business men of Spain, seizure of financial control by German bankers —all these things abetted the decay of the Spanish monopoly.

But the worst came when the Netherlands, richest province of the empire, revolted in 1566. We shall see when we study the two Reformations that Philip II's harsh measures against Protestants were largely responsible for the revolt; its effects for a time on trade were stupendous. Antwerp, a Flemish city, had been the

commercial and financial center of Europe. This supremacy now passed to the Dutch city, Amsterdam. During the revolt Dutch sailors captured the rich eastern routes and trading possessions formerly belonging to Portugal. They even got a foothold in Brazil. By virtue of the discoveries of Henry Hudson in 1609 and settlement in 1621, the Dutch claimed territory around the mouth of the Hudson River. Here, on Manhattan Island, they founded New Amsterdam, the present New York City. To add to Spain's losses, England and France claimed the finest portion of North America.

France, and especially England, entered somewhat later into colonial and commercial competition. Both, with no success, attempted to wrest from the Dutch a share of the Far Eastern trade. They then turned, almost simultaneously, westward to America. In 1607 a company of daring Englishmen settled at the mouth of a river in what is now Virginia. The river they called James in honor of the sovereign who had given them their charter, and the settlement on that river they called Jamestown. Thirteen years later, another but different group, refugees from the persecutions carried on by the same King James, namely, certain radical Protestants called Separatists, landed with a small ship, the *Mayflower,* on the bleak New England coast off Cape Cod. There, after hardships almost unbearable, they established the colony of Plymouth. The

seed of English colonization in America was sown. But a year after the first English settlers had implanted themselves at Jamestown, a great French explorer founded Quebec on the St. Lawrence and staked out the whole basin of that mighty river as the New France. What happened when the expanding English settlements clashed with the Dutch in New York and the French in the north constitutes another colorful chapter of history.

The effects of the discovery of the world by man in the Renaissance period were tremendous. To grasp the significance of the results of discoveries, colonization, and expanding trade staggers the imagination. In 1400 the known world stretched from the British Isles to the little-frequented Far East, north to the Scandinavian peninsula, and south to the northern coast of Africa. Scarcely more than a century later the present extent of the earth was known. Europe was started on world conquest; the world was Europeanized. The focal point of European commerce moved from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic. The financial center shifted from Florence to Augsburg, to Antwerp, to Amsterdam. The American continent furnished a new frontier for the adventurer, as well as a haven for the refugee. New markets, new sources of material simultaneously opened. Well may the whole movement be called the Commercial Revolution. The middle class grew

in strength. Let us now briefly examine some of the secondary effects of the movement.

There was the importation—from the seemingly inexhaustible mines of newly-discovered America—of gold and silver, a phenomenon which was most influential in substituting a money system for the system of barter and exchange in kind. This instituted a money-economy, the detailed results of which are examined in the Outline of Business. It is sufficient to say here that there followed an amazing inflation and a necessary adjustment of prices and wages.

When money became synonymous with wealth, the nations with colonies sought to bring gold into the mother country by exploiting their colonies. This effort crystallized into an economic system called mercantilism, which we shall discuss in a subsequent chapter. It is to be remembered that mercantilism is a direct outgrowth of the Commercial Revolution.

The finding of an all-water route to the Orient allowed spices to be imported in such quantity that they became a widely used commodity. Articles of bulk like tea, coffee, rice, and sugar were also imported and soon added to the European diet. Altho gold and silver were at first the only imports from America, the potato and tobacco ultimately found their places on the list, as did sugar when African slaves were sent to the islands of the Caribbean to work on plantations.

We have noted that the gild system began to decline when the Italians started trading expeditions to the East. Enterprisers were needed to float ventures on a large scale. There arose simultaneously banking houses to meet the increased financial needs. The increased trade resulting from the discoveries caused banking operations to assume multiplied proportions. The Florentine Medici, the richest company of the latter half of the fifteenth century, commanded resources equivalent to $7,500,000; the Fuggers of Augsburg—who incidentally could even influence the election of a Holy Roman Emperor—operated with a capital estimated at $40,000,000.

Increasingly it became apparent that the form of even the merchant-companies would not suffice for the new colonial enterprises. The old companies had been family partnerships, which lacked security and continuity since death or even a quarrel might upset their equilibrium. The new needs gave rise in the last of the sixteenth century to the joint-stock company, father of the modern corporation, with shares which could be bought and sold, a board of directors, and an elected manager of competence and talent. Liability in these new enterprises was limited, furthermore, to the amount any individual had invested. The buying and selling of shares started speculation; there were bear and bull markets in Antwerp and Amster-

dam. After 1600 practically all the great trading companies, the great colonial enterprises, assumed the joint-stock plan. Thus the Virginia Company, the Hudson's Bay Company, the African Company, the Dutch East India Company, the Company of the One Hundred Associates, the Danish African Company, and hosts of others. The evolution of these companies, it will be remembered, played no small part in American colonial history.

All this accelerated activity gave rise to a new class, the middle class, business men, capitalists, residing chiefly in the towns—bourgeoisie they are often called. This class, becoming wealthy, was destined to play an increasingly important rôle in the history of the world.

XIV

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

A NEW art, a new literature, new science, new inventions, a new monarchy, a new world—these were some of the first fruits of the Renaissance in western Europe. We have considered them as the results, almost inevitable, of the European's passing from childhood to youth; they are phenomena which came into being as a part of the triple discovery of man's self, his past, and the world. We turn now to the final, but by no means least important, phenomenon of the Renaissance period, the breaking of the unity of the Catholic Church. This was somewhat of a threefold phenomenon involving: the Protestant Reformation, in which certain groups broke definitely away from the authority of the Catholic Church and established new forms of the Christian religion; the Counter-Reformation, in which the effort was made to correct abuses in the Catholic Church and regain for her the ground lost by the Protestant Reformation; and, finally, a series of wars which, altho having also a dynastic basis, have almost all an underlying religious motif. In the present chapter we shall consider the Protestant Reformation. But first we must scrutinize briefly the scene on the European stage at the opening of the sixteenth century.

Italy, center of the Revival of Learning, underwent a queer political development during the Renaissance. During the Middle Age the new Italian towns had joined forces with the pope against the Holy Roman Emperor, partly because the principle of feudalism which the emperor seemed to personify threatened to thwart the growth of the towns, and partly because the emperor, who was a German, seemed to represent foreign domination of a growing Italian nationalism. These were the principles that divided the Guelfs and the Ghibellines. The emperor lost. But the Italian towns did not unite. They quarreled among themselves, and in northern Italy the stronger cities overcame the weaker. The same lack of capacity to unify accounted partly for their inability to secure inner harmony and a strong domestic government; they fell prey to factions and despots. Three northern towns, Milan, Venice, and Florence, emerge as powerful by 1500, controlling the provinces around them. They, together with the Kingdom of Naples in the South and the States of the Church, control Italy at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Milan had come in 1450 under the rule of a military despot, the Sforza. Venice, once center of the commercial world, became a commercial oligarchy. Florence, whose wealth and culture were unmatched in Italy, tho she retained a republican form of government longer than her

sister cities, passed towards the end of the fifteenth century into the control of a single family, the wealthy Medici.

The State of the Church was the temporal dominion of the pope built up around the city of Rome during the Middle Age. The popes of the fifteenth century spent most of their time trying to reduce to submission the powerful feudal lords within their realm. In setting out to increase its temporal power the Renaissance papacy was simply accepting rather than stemming the movement of the times towards worldliness. Furthermore, reflecting the Italy of their day, the Renaissance popes took up humanism, pagan philosophy, and the patronage of arts and letters. They were eager for the Church to have her share of the glories of the Renaissance. Hence, while trying to consolidate their Italian states, they laid heavier financial burdens on all Christendom to support a magnificent court at Rome and to allow the Church to act as patron to the painters, architects, and sculptors of the time. That this spirit led them to worldly excesses cannot be denied.

The kingdom of Naples had been since 1435 the possession of Aragon. But it had been wrested from a French ruler. The French crown continued to assert its claim to the Kingdom, which included southern Italy and the island of Sicily, and in 1494 Charles VIII of France set

out to make good the claim by his famous invasion of Italy.

When Italy in the thirteenth century threw off the yoke of the emperor, the Holy Roman Empire included practically nothing outside Germany. Hence Germany and the Empire came to mean one and the same thing. But the feudal lords controlled Germany. During the fourteenth century they made the emperor elective. Seven princes—four lay and three ecclesiastical—elected him. Three houses of the imperial legislature controlled his every action after election. A nationalist movement in the fifteenth century failed. Germany remained disunited until the nineteenth century.

Frederick III, of the House of Hapsburg, Holy Roman Emperor from 1440 to 1493, was a man of remarkable foresight. Had he lived in our time, Frederick would probably have headed some great business combination. He evolved in his day a matrimonial program, furthered by his son Maximilian I, which in 1519 was to bring under the dominion of one individual more lands and more people than under any other Christian sovereign.

Maximilian, Frederick's son, who from his father inherited Western Austria on the upper Rhine, Austria, Carinthia, Carniola, and Tyrol, was joined in wedlock to Mary of Burgundy, heiress of the Netherlands and Franche-Comté. To Maximilian and Mary was born a son, Philip,

who in time by marriage combined his wide possessions with those of an even greater heiress, Joanna, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. The first-born of this union, Charles, therefore inherited Spain, the Netherlands, and Austria, with all their possessions. Over these he became ruler in 1519. Two years later, on his twenty-first birthday, he was made, by family influence, national sentiment, and the money of the Fuggers (great German bankers) Holy Roman Emperor. This Charles V is the chief actor in the European theater during the first half of the sixteenth century—powerful because he inherited much, reasonably capable, the enemy of the Reformation—a figure sinister to some, fascinating and splendid to others.

Spain, foremost of Charles's inheritances, was a strong monarchy when he received it. We have noted the significance in this respect of the marriage of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile. Their final conquest of the Moors, great triumph tho it was, had one drawback—it led to the rise of Christian intolerance in Spain, finding its climactic expression in the Inquisition. This dark institution, placed now in control of the crown rather than of the pope, embarked upon its bloody history. Jews and Moors were bade to accept Christianity or face the Inquisition. Thousands met death. Other thousands left Spain. And Spain was the loser. As in other

countries, strong monarchy developed at the expense of the national legislature.

In France, too, the strong monarchy thrived. The Hundred Years' War, as we have noted, strengthened national sentiment and the monarch. In 1439 the Estates General, the national assembly, had voluntarily given up to King Charles VII its right to confirm the levying of the *taille,* the tax which made up the chief revenue of the land. Louis XI (1461-1483), Charles's son and successor, by diplomacy and cunning broke the power of many of the feudal lords and added province after province to the royal domain. This policy of centralization and union was furthered by the marriage of Charles VIII, Louis's successor, to Anne, heiress of the duchy of Brittany. After the middle of the fifteenth century the Estates General rarely met. Even the pope's power in France had been limited by an assertion of the independence of the French Church in the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges in 1438.

Henry VII, first Tudor king of England (1485-1509), who took the throne when he emerged victorious from the Wars of the Roses, by his wisdom and subtlety overcame to a large degree both the great nobles and a Parliament which earlier had managed to arrogate to itself a goodly part in the government. Henry VII's power was endangered from without chiefly by France and Scotland. He protected himself

against Scotland by marrying his daughter Margaret to James IV of Scotland, and protected himself against France by a dynastic union with the Spanish throne.

We have seen that the Middle Age was—to as great a degree as has ever been attained—an era of European unity. Epigrammatically, there were no states but estates. In the very name, Holy Roman Empire, there was the thought of a great European commonwealth under the double guardianship of pope and emperor. We have now surveyed the rise of national states in three countries of Europe: Spain, France, and England. That these should compete for European hegemony and the control of the resources of the new world and the Far East was almost inevitable. That competition was to precipitate many modern problems and entail numerous wars. The task of maintaining peace—or at least a truce between the contending powers—was solved by the so-called "balance of power." When one nation became dangerously powerful, the others were likely to combine in opposition. The new national states, furthermore, were to constitute a powerful factor in the Reformation.

The first evidence of this international—or dynastic—competition was the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII of France in 1494, marking the beginning of the Franco-Spanish struggle over the unhappy Peninsula. At the same time we

note the decline of Italy, whose towns and states were unable to unite politically or culturally.

Charles VIII led his swashbuckling army into Italy in 1494. None of the five important states, standing separately, offered any serious opposition. The Aragon ruler was driven from the throne of Naples. Ferdinand of Spain was quick to retaliate, and with the aid of some Italian allies he drove Charles back to France. Charles died in 1498 and his successor, Louis XII, took up the cause, but with no avail. In 1504 Ferdinand of Spain secured ultimately his claim to Naples. Milan was tossed back and forth between the contending powers. Venice and the Papal States remained relatively untouched. Florence lost her independence under the tyranny of the Medici, restored to power by Spanish arms.

The sun of Renaissance Italy had set. Her jealous and independent states could not unite; their culture decayed, their brightness faded. They fell before strong nations, as their counterparts, the Greek city-states—also unable to effect union—had fallen before Roman legions. The Renaissance scene shifts across the Alps and merges into the Protestant Reformation.

The Reformation came first in Germany. The Renaissance had not taken the same course in Germany as it had across the Alps in Italy. The Italian humanists, when turning back to the classics, conjured up the philosophy and litera-

ture of pagan writers. Hence Renaissance Italy, as Mr. Sidney Dark says, worshiped Pan while not daring quite to forget Christ. The Church with its headship in Rome was in no small way influenced by Italy's paganized love of beauty, materialism, and luxury.

But across the Alps the German humanists, notably John Reuchlin and Erasmus, in turning to the past, delved not so much into pagan writings as into the writings and teachings of the early Christian fathers and of the Bible itself. They discovered what they believed to be the pristine purity of early Christianity and of the early Church. While remaining loyal to the Church, this group of earnest students could not help but contrast the outward magnificence, luxury, and materialism of the Bride of Christ during the Renaissance with the simplicity and piety of the early followers of the Master.

But the Reformation in Germany had political and economic as well as intellectual causes. It is hard for us to understand to-day the breadth of power exercised by the Catholic Church during the Middle Age. In addition to universal membership, practically everyone was tithed by the Church for its support; there was no easy modern system of voluntary contributions. Attacking the authority or doctrines of the Church was punishable by courts; it constituted a sort of ecclesiastical treason. In each country, too—and the German states constituted

no exception—the Church had extensive property holdings and from these the Church collected taxes. The pope also appointed ecclesiastical officials in the various countries. During the Middle Age, furthermore, the pope asserted that his was the supreme power on earth, both spiritual and temporal. Such power the rising strong monarchies had challenged not without effect. The French Church, indeed, had achieved a certain degree of independence. Spain and England had both demanded the right to nominate their own bishops and had forbidden the appealing of ecclesiastical cases from their realms to Rome.

But Germany, as we have seen, did not develop a strong monarchy, with the result that the Church seemed to try to compensate in Germany for her setbacks in other countries. The fiscal demands of the Renaissance popes led to abuses and to exploitation of the German people. The popes laid heavy taxes there which fell ultimately on the people. They abused their appointive power by taking money from candidates to office—the sin of simony. They used the pretext of a crusade against the Turks—which never took place—for special assessments.

All this the Germans resented, not only because of the injustice involved, but because in the fifteenth century there arose in Germany a strong feeling of nationalism, which, altho it never materialized in a unified nation, neverthe-

less intensified opposition to abuse by an Italian ruler, even tho he were head of Christ's Church. From the German diet went forth protest after protest, but Rome only bore down the harder.

The climax came with the Church's attempt to sell indulgences in Germany on an unprecedented scale. An indulgence is a substitute bought with money for the temporal penalty a sinner must pay for his sins—by good works on this earth or the endurance of punishment in purgatory. Indulgences were dispensed by the pope from the Treasury of Graces, a surplus of good works accumulated by early Christians who had suffered greater penalties than their sins demanded. The selling of indulgences was not an uncommon practise of the medieval Church. Often the proceeds were used for good causes, such as the financing of a crusade. But the widespread abuse of this motive during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, again particularly in Germany, excited opposition. Germany became infested with indulgence salesmen, hawkers representing the pope, who sold for money these certificates absolving the sinner from ordinary penalties. Sometimes, it is said, they were advertised not only as absolutions from penalties but as evidences of forgiveness of sin from God himself.

It was against one of these hawkers, a Dominican friar named Tetzel, that Martin Luther in 1517 arose to protest, declaring that such in-

discriminate selling of indulgences was sin. Who was this Luther? Born in Thuringia in 1483, Martin Luther came of peasant ancestry. He was educated at the university of Erfurt for the law, but became frightened during a thunderstorm in 1505 and took the vow to become a monk. He entered a monastery, studied St. Augustine, who had held that salvation was possible through faith rather than good works, and was led to the conviction that what a man believed, not what he did, would guarantee him the kingdom of heaven. The seed of Luther's fundamental revolt against the existing Church was sown. As a professor of theology at the university of Wittenberg he based his lectures not so much on the teachings of medieval schoolmen as on the writings of the early Christian Fathers and the Bible; Luther became a German humanist, one of the discoverers of the past.

To understand what led Luther to revolt, it is necessary to try to recreate what, as a result of his study and meditation, went on in his mind. Like every medieval Christian, he was interested in salvation, assurance of a life beyond the grave. What was necessary to gain that celestial end? The Catholic Church taught that in addition to faith good works were necessary; the believer must go through the sacraments, perform holy acts. The prescribing of these works was the exclusive right of the Church. Were both faith and good works required for salvation?

That was the question which drove this German monk to agony of spirit. Ultimately he fought it out with himself and decided that faith and faith alone, the simple surrender of one's mind and will to God, was necessary to forgiveness, to peace, to salvation itself. And when Luther searched for confirmation of his new conviction he found it not only in St. Augustine but in St. Paul.

That the position was revolutionary so far as the Church was concerned, is easy to see. When Luther reduced to secondary importance the need of good works as a means to salvation he eliminated the need of a great part of the organizational structure of the Church. Without the need of good works, indulgences, the many forms of penance, in fact the sacraments and the clergy, became superfluous. That extreme, needless to say, was not reached.

It must be remembered, too, that Luther was a German not untrue to the typical characteristics of his people. He had independence, was a bit stubborn, was hot-tempered when aroused, but usually tactful and practical. He was possessed of a real love of knowledge and a devotion to the truth as he saw it. Nor was Luther lacking in a certain mysticism.

He was not, furthermore, without a certain nationalistic feeling. In fact, Mr. Sidney Dark says:

> The most interesting aspect of the work of Luther is that he was a German revolting against international authority. . . . There is immense significance in Luther's provocative inquiry: "What have we Germans to do with St. Peter?" It is perfectly true that Luther was a Christian mystic, preaching, as he believed, a return to primitive and purer Christianity; it is equally true that Luther was a German in revolt against an authority that was non-German.[1]

When Luther became incensed at Tetzel, the indulgence-hawker, he framed his protest against such action in the form of ninety-five theses and nailed them on the door of the church at Wittenberg, October 31, 1517. They were written in Latin for reading by the educated, but were soon translated into German, and in a few weeks spread like wildfire throughout the land. Luther was swept off his feet, for as yet he had no idea of repudiating the Catholic Church. Support gathered on one hand; on the other the Church opposed him. As opposition grew, Luther began to strengthen his position. From 1517 to 1520 he broke farther and farther away from the Church. When drawn into a debate in 1520 he became convinced that the papacy was not an institution of divine origin but of human development. He had visited Rome in 1511 and was shocked at the materialism, luxury, and worldly living of the pope and his court. Now he cleared his own views and wrote pamphlet

[1] *The Story of the Renaissance* (Doran), 1924, p. 140.

after pamphlet attacking clergy, sacraments, and the pope. Pope Leo X in 1520 condemned him as a heretic; Luther burned the papal bull and threw into the fire for good measure the books of Canon or Church Law while the assembled citizens of Wittenberg cheered.

But the climax of the drama had not yet come. The Emperor Charles V was crowned in 1520; his first problem was to settle the heresy of this German monk, who had just been condemned by the pope. Because Luther was supported by a number of princes, Charles was too wise to condemn him unheard. He called the Diet of Worms. Luther was summoned and appeared on April 17, 1521. "Will you recant your heresies?" asked Emperor Charles. Luther demanded to be proved wrong by the Bible. This, not the pope, was final authority to him now. Recant he would not. "Here I stand," he cried, "I can not do otherwise. So help me God. Amen."

Charles V issued his edict against Luther, but circumstances kept the emperor away from the empire for the next decade and the edict went unenforced while Lutheranism spread. Opinion burned into action. Monks and nuns, following Luther's example, renounced their vows and married. Ecclesiastical and monastic properties were confiscated to the profit of the new religion and German princes. The pope's authority was flouted, Catholic practises abandoned. Gradually the reform got out of hand and became radical.

[illegible] always a consummation devoutly to be wished for the teacher. The teacher has authority for [illegible] and only religious. Everyone knows the [illegible] story of Wordsworth, which he was [illegible] the last journey into Germany, he [illegible] to great religious and philosophic [illegible] of Nature. When the procession [illegible] by [illegible] and beauty and [illegible] by the [illegible] Germans in the [illegible], [illegible] called [illegible] Tree.

Nevertheless Plutarch's [illegible] attempts to [illegible] the [illegible] Greek [illegible] Roman and French [illegible] have [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible]. [illegible] a [illegible] of more [illegible] to life, with [illegible] and [illegible] on [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] in the [illegible] [illegible]. In [illegible], [illegible] a [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible] [illegible] by the [illegible]. When the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

When civil war seemed inevitable, circumstances again intervened. Charles had to repulse the Turks from Europe and fight a final duel with France, and the wars of religion did not break out until 1546.

In a series of wars from 1546 to 1553 Charles failed to suppress the Lutherans. The French seized this opportunity to embarrass Charles, and he was forced to relinquish three valuable bishoprics, Metz, Toul, and Verdun, to the new allies. He abdicated in 1556, leaving Germany and its problems to his brother Ferdinand. The German religious strife was temporarily settled by the Peace of Augsburg, 1555, which allowed each German prince to choose either Lutheranism or Catholicism. Their subjects had to follow the course of their rulers or move to another province, on the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio*. This action marks the formal abandonment of the unity of the Church. By conceding a territorial basis of religion in Germany, it probably made more remote than ever the hope of a unified Germany. The Peace of Augsburg did not recognize any other forms of Protestantism which had sprung up save Lutheranism. Ecclesiastical princes converted to Protestantism, according to the Peace of Augsburg, had to surrender their property back to the Catholic Church, a concession pregnant with future trouble. The Peace of Augsburg, then, was really little better than a truce.

Luther died in 1546, but his cause prevailed. His influence in history can scarcely be overestimated. He broke the unity of the Catholic Church, a fact which has no mere religious significance, for the breaking of the unity of the Church was a great factor in establishing separate nations in Europe. He established the principle that in matters spiritual the individual might interpret the Scriptures for himself. What is of scarcely less importance, Luther, under the stress of controversy and probably unconsciously, inaugurated the scientific method of investigation as a new approach to the sources of knowledge. Lutheranism spread almost immediately to the Scandinavian countries. And the effect of Luther's revolt swept over Europe. To the growth of the Reformation we now turn.

The church evolved by Martin Luther had its control placed by the Peace of Augsburg in the hands of the prince in whose realm it was accepted. Lutheranism was therefore especially welcomed in those countries ruled by monarchs, particularly when the rulers were partially motivated to revolt against the traditional Catholic Church by the desire to increase the national wealth and revenue by seizing the large property holdings of the Mother Church within their realms. This in no small part explains the relatively quick acceptance of Lutheranism in the Scandinavian countries: Denmark, Norway, and the newly-established Kingdom of Sweden. It

was brought in largely by the rulers, tho they were supported by the aroused nationalist feeling of the people, which resented foreign domination in matters religious and political.

But there was in sixteenth-century Europe one important country ruled not by a monarch but by magistrates elected by the people. This was the Swiss Confederation, a loose union of practically self-governing cantons, whose courageous struggle for independence from the House of Hapsburg need not concern us here. We need now only emphasize that Switzerland was the cradle of a different revolt against the Catholic Church and of a form of Protestantism which by circumstantial necessity had to be adapted to a self-governing people.

The forerunner of this new kind of Protestant church, the originator of the Reformation in Switzerland, was Ulrich Zwingli, a native Swiss, an excellently schooled man, an ordained priest, and an enthusiastic humanist, who about 1520 evolved a reformed church which in matters of faith agreed generally with Lutheranism, but in ecclesiastical organization was not subservient to a prince. It was built rather on the foundation of self-government. Zwingli's Reformed Church in 1549 was merged with that created by a third great leader of the Reformation, John Calvin.

John Calvin was a Frenchman and he was en-

dowed with a mind characteristically French in its ruthless logic. Born in 1509, steeped in classical education and theology at the universities of Paris and Orleans, Calvin studied first for the priesthood but then turned while at Orleans to the secular subject of jurisprudence, which tended only to sharpen his precision of mind. Passionately righteous, probably not forgetting entirely his early inclination towards the priesthood, Calvin was almost inevitably drawn into contact with a group of French spirits who were in sympathy with the Reformation movement. When the French king attacked heretics, Calvin in 1534 fled to the Swiss city of Basel, where, two years later, when he was but twenty-six years of age, he published the *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* which, combining a wealth of information with invincible logic, constituted, according to Mr. Ferdinand Schevill, "the most scientific and critical attempt that had yet been made to reconstruct the Church of Christ on the basis of the evidence supplied by the New Testament." The *Institutes* advanced the thesis that the Church of the Middle Age had made many additions to the apostolic structure not justified by the Scriptures. Rejecting papal infallibility, Calvin insisted upon the infallibility only of the Bible.

When he came to Geneva as chief pastor of the city, Calvin established what he believed to be a Christian commonwealth where the rule of

life was a strict—and at times harsh—application of the New Testament. In this unusual and interesting theocracy were exemplified the three theories or ideas which Calvin contributed to modern religion and for that matter to modern civilization.[2]

Calvin advocated a democratic church government. Each congregation was to be a self-governing body subject neither to prince nor potentate nor to any episcopal hierarchy. This form of ecclesiastical organization was not dictated for Calvin by the democratic form of Swiss political government. Rather, he believed his form to be a model of the original and pure Church as Christ conceived it. All were equal among the twelve disciples. All were equal in those first churches to whom St. Paul preached and wrote. His authority was in Holy Writ. And the championing of this equality among believers had, in contrast to Luther's prince-controlled church, tremendous popular appeal. Here was a church where the man of the middle class found himself on a level with lord and monarch. And here was an idea—the idea of equality—which without doubt gave immeasurable impetus to the rise of the common man, and which—tho nearly 250 years were to pass before its materialization—was to inspire the

[2] For a fuller exposition see Ferdinand Schevill, *A History of Europe* (Harcourt, Brace), p. 132 ff.

world as an ideal for the government of a state as well as for the government of a church.

Calvin's second great contribution was his emphasis on moral conduct. In his theocratic community right living was not a matter of choice. Men, women, and children were moral by coercion. And Calvin's code, as immutable as the law of the Medes and the Persians, was not diluted with the milk of human sympathy; it applied to belief as well as to action. There were no dances, no festivities, no theaters. Church attendance was compulsory. Adultery and heresy were alike punished by death. A poet had his head cut off because his verses were offensive. A Spanish reformer was burned because he did not agree with Calvin about the mystery of the Trinity. A church police force searched out offenders; a civil court imposed punishment. Individualists in thought or action found no asylum in Geneva. The early New England town with its stocks and whipping posts had its counterpart in this theocratic commonwealth.

Calvin's third and probably best-known contribution was a theological one, the doctrine of election or predestination, which at root was the conception of an overwhelmingly omnipotent God. The Creator was majestic, mighty, all-powerful. Man, in contrast, was powerless, insignificant, less than nothing. Hence, Calvin in the unwavering pursuance of his logic deduced that sinful man could gain salvation neither by the

good works recommended by the Catholic Church, nor by the faith preached by Luther. Only God in His infinite mercy could grant to the individual soul salvation, Calvin decreed. And in His omniscience God knows ere a babe is born whether its soul is to be saved or damned. Helpless indeed and hopeless was man's plight under the Calvinistic doctrine. Nothing that man could do would change by jot or tittle his eternal destiny. It would seem—and there were those who prophesied it even in Calvin's time—that such a religion could breed only discouragement and a sense of futility comparable to Oriental fatalism.

That the disciples of Calvinism, on the contrary, have from the beginning proved to be among the most vigorous, courageous, and indomitable of men, has been called repeatedly one of the curious paradoxes of history. But the paradox yields partially at least to resolution. For the true follower of Calvin has, besides an overawing fear of omnipotent God, another passion equally fervid—the burning passion to bring about on earth the kingdom of heaven. Hence, the Calvinist on his knees may be a hopeless determinist; on his feet he is a zealous missionary. The belief in predestination stays not the action of evangelization.

This missionary zeal was manifest from the beginning. From Geneva, where there was a reputable educational system, including an

academy for the training of pastors, scores of apostles went all over Europe carrying the new gospel. To the vitality of their efforts and of the religion they preached and practised, the history of the times attests. Within a century Calvinism was an influence in the English church, became under the dynamic leadership of John Knox the prevailing religion in Scotland, brought about more than any other single factor the revolt of the Netherlands from Spain, was a foremost cause of a civil war in France, and spread even to the rocky coast of New England.

There remains to be considered one other chapter in the Protestant Reformation: the revolt of England from the Catholic Church. This was immediately motivated by political and personal rather than by religious reasons; intellectually and theologically, therefore, it did not assume the importance of the movements led by Luther and Calvin, nor did it produce an outstanding figure to rank with these two.

There were in early sixteenth-century England, it is true, factors tending towards a revolt from Mother Church, similar to those manifested in Germany, the Scandinavian countries, and Switzerland: intellectual groups interested in the Reformation, a feeling that the clergy needed moral reform, a growing sense of nationalism which resented foreign domination in any form, and a strong monarchy jealous of any actual or potential encroachment on its power. But, de-

spite the force of all these factors, the immediate reason why England broke from the Church of Rome in 1534 was that England's king, Henry VIII, wanted a divorce from a queen of whom, for various reasons, he had grown tired; and when the Catholic Church refused to give it to him, he set up a separate Church of England with himself at its head, a church whose ecclesiastical officers had to accede to his wishes.

Henry VIII had married Catherine of Aragon, daughter of the famed Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. Because she had been the wife of his deceased older brother, Arthur, the marriage required a papal dispensation to circumvent the canon law that a man may not marry his brother's wife—even tho the brother be dead. Henry was apparently contented with Catherine for eighteen years. Not only in marriage had he been a good Catholic; his was the pen which wrote a bitter refutation to Lutheran doctrines, an action for which the pope rewarded him with the added title, "Defender of the Faith," an epithet still borne by English monarchs. But there developed around 1530 two circumstances which changed Henry's attitude towards his marriage: altho Catherine had presented him with six children, only one, a daughter, had survived, and Henry wanted a male heir to secure the succession of the ruling line; and further, about this time Henry experienced a terrific in-

fatuation for a certain black-eyed Anne Boleyn maid-in-waiting at the court.

Henry appealed, through his trusted Cardinal Wolsey, to Pope Clement VII to have his marriage annulled, contending that since the union was originally legal only by grace of a papal dispensation, it would be a simple matter now to declare it null and void. Clement VII, tho he might have desired to do so, was stayed from granting the request by two difficulties: it was not expedient for a pope to reverse the decision of a predecessor, and it was still less expedient for His Holiness to oppose the Emperor Charles V, foremost Catholic monarch, who supported the natural objections of his aunt, the Queen Catherine, to the proposed nullification of the royal marriage.

After patient delays, Henry, whose passion for the young Anne Boleyn grew daily stronger, ultimately took the matter into his own hands. Step by step he led his subservient Parliament to pass measures denying the authority of the pope and establishing a separate Church of England with the king as its ecclesiastical head.

The change was one of organization rather than of dogma, but it precipitated a conflict which did not end for over a century. Faithful Catholics who continued to affirm papal supremacy were beheaded; Protestants who denied a single Catholic tenet save the supremacy of the pope were burned. On the two scores, thousands

suffered the fate of martyrs. Henry—besides marrying at different times six wives—took just one more major step against the Catholic Church: for reasons chiefly economic he suppressed the monasteries in England and seized their lands and properties.

Henry's strict adherence to the Catholic faith despite his break with Rome did not permit the English Church to become Protestantized until the reign of his son and successor, Edward VI (1547-1553). Under the influence of Somerset, head of the regency for the boy-king, real Protestant innovations were made: English displaced Latin in the church service, ikons were broken, priests were allowed to marry; finally, there was published in 1549 the *Book of Common Prayer,* Archbishop Cranmer's adaptation into majestic English of the ancient services of the Church.

But Edward was succeeded by Mary Tudor, daughter of Catherine of Aragon and spiritual daughter of the Roman Catholic Church, who instituted a full Catholic restoration in England. By Act of Parliament the country was brought back under the pope. Married clergy were expelled. Services were again conducted in Latin. And Mary was taken as wife by his Catholic Majesty, Philip II of Spain.

But Mary's reign was brief. When she died, in 1558, without heirs, the throne passed, as provided by the will of Henry VIII, to Elizabeth,

in whose glorious reign of almost half a century England became again and definitely Protestant. The supremacy of the pope was again denied in favor of the ecclesiastical headship of the monarch. A revised *Book of Common Prayer* was made the uniform manual of worship. The *Thirty-nine Articles* ratified by Parliament imposed a uniform and Protestant doctrine on the Anglican Church: the Scriptures were accepted as final authority, justification was by faith alone, clergy were allowed to marry. The Anglican Church as it exists to-day, in both England and America, is much more the child of Elizabeth than of Henry. Elizabeth was not tolerant towards Catholics in the realm, tho it must be admitted that the death penalty was rarely inflicted for religious beliefs alone; the victims were usually political plotters as well.

The Protestant Reformation broke the authority and the unity of the Catholic Church; a theocracy of the western world with Rome as its head was no longer a possibility after the Reformation. As a corollary the movement undoubtedly lent great impetus to the rise of national states and the spirit of nationalism which made them possible. Notably in England, Scotland, Holland, Denmark, and Sweden, forms of Protestantism became national religions. Protestantism, particularly Calvinism, as we have noted, accelerated the trend towards democracy and towards the ascendancy of the middle class and

of the common people. Eventually the Protestant Reformation may have led to the growth of toleration, but the growth was very slow and even to-day one wonders whether toleration has been achieved. Finally, the Protestant Reformation brought about the Catholic Reformation, which some historians prefer to call the Counter-Reformation.

XV

THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND THE WARS OF RELIGION

Undoubtedly the passing of the northern races from the Roman fold awakened all ranks of clergy and people in the Catholic Church to the need of a drastic housecleaning. Among the most obvious causes of the revolt of the Protestants was the wide-spread neglect of spiritual duties and obligations and the materialism and immorality among great numbers of the clergy of all degrees, from parish priests to the popes at St. Peter's. That these conditions were without exception in the Church is by no means implied. Furthermore, many who remained faithful Catholics had as vigorously attacked evil conditions within the Church as did the Protestants who left it. But the very nature of the inherent structure of the Church almost demanded that reform to be effective must receive its impetus from the top.

Hence the Catholic Reformation did not seriously begin until the spiritual lethargy of the Renaissance popes was overcome by more vigorous successors. The first of these was Paul III, pope from 1543 to 1549, who began to attack the evils of the Church. The real effort at re-

form did not come, however, until the reign of Paul IV (1555-1559).

The procedure of Paul IV and his successors in setting their house in order undoubtedly found precedent in earlier localized action to reform the Spanish Church. In Spain, under the leadership of Cardinal Ximenes, trusted prelate of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Spanish clergy had been purged of their shortcomings and instilled with new vigor. The spiritual life of the monastic orders had been renewed. Schools and seminaries had been established in answer to the humanists' charge of notorious ignorance on the part of the clergy. Priests had been made sharply aware of the vows of their orders. The influence of the spiritual revival in Spain was slowly but surely felt throughout the entire Church.

Out of Spain, too, came the figure who towered above all others in the Catholic Reformation, the militant and dynamic personality, Ignatius Loyola, founder of that literal militia of pope and Church, the Society of Jesus. Ignatius Loyola was a Spanish nobleman and soldier who, chancing to read a Life of Christ while convalescing from a wound, experienced a religious conversion, forsook all earthly things, and dedicated his life to God and the Church. He soon discovered his need for further education, and at the age of thirty-three he went to Paris and began the study of Latin, theology, and philos-

ophy. No sacrifice or humility was too great for him; in the beginning he, a grown man, studied with small boys in the lower forms. And, ironically enough, it is possible that he later studied in the same classroom with another strikingly similar yet strikingly different religious leader, the Protestant John Calvin.

It was at Paris that Ignatius Loyola gathered six zealous companions who, with him, became the nucleus of the Jesuit order. In 1540 the seven journeyed to Rome, received the blessing of Pope Paul III, and then, with a military regimen and a singleness of purpose reflecting the original profession of their founder, set out to convert the heathen, and more especially Protestant heretics; to educate the young, to preach, and by whatever methods could be utilized, to restore the Church to its ancient power and glory.

The part played by the Jesuits in the Catholic Reformation is an inestimably great one. Gathering and training recruits with special care, establishing hundreds of schools, many of which soon became famous, gaining influence—often by insidious methods—with outstanding Protestant personages, many of whom they converted, the Jesuits, by the end of the sixteenth century, had become a vitalizing factor in the Catholic Church and the driving force in its Reformation. And their work has never lapsed. To convert the Protestant is and always has

been their special mission, but equally important have been their missionary activities—carrying the gospel to the wilds of America and to the farthest Orient.

Another great agency in promoting and solidifying the Catholic revival was the concluding session of the Council of Trent (1562-1563). Its accomplishments were both organizational and doctrinal. The sale of church offices was forbidden, pluralism was stopped—thenceforward bishops were compelled to reside in their dioceses—seminaries were established, and sermons were to be preached, it was suggested, not in Latin, but in the language of the people. Traditional doctrines were reaffirmed and differences of doctrinal opinion were condemned. The pope—thanks largely to Jesuit influence in the council—was declared the supreme authority in the Church, thus ending a long-standing controversy as to whether pope or council was supreme. The council authorized the Holy Father to compile a list of books which faithful Catholics were forbidden to read. And any infringement of these canons or decrees, it developed, was to be summarily dealt with by the ecclesiastical court of the Inquisition, which now greatly accelerated and enlarged its activities, particularly in Italy. Truly the Church was girding its loins for battle. The combat was not long delayed.

The religious upheaval of the two Reformations threw Europe into a series of wars in

which, altho political issues played no small part, the line-up was largely Catholic against Protestant in the effort to determine where each would be supreme. Roughly, these wars divide themselves into three main phases: first, the attempt of Philip II, Charles V's successor in the Iberian peninsula, to Catholicize Europe while adding to the temporal glories of Spain, a struggle which involved wars with England and France, and a long but unsuccessful attempt to check the triumphant revolt of the Protestant Netherlands—all of which ended in the falling of Spain from the first position in Europe; second, the civil wars in France, caused largely by a conflict between Catholics and the French Calvinists, called Huguenots; and third, the Thirty Years' War, a series of combats fought in Germany, where the main issue again arose out of the counter-claims of Protestants and Catholics.

It will not serve our purpose to trace the detailed military developments of the religious wars. Rather, we shall inquire how Europe was affected by this last act in the drama which opened with the revolt of Luther and the election of Charles V and closed with the Peace of Westphalia.

Philip II of Spain must be remembered as, above all else, the arch-enemy of Protestantism. "I would rather," he said, "lose all my states and even a hundred lives, if I had them, than

accept the seigniory of heretics." It appeared at the moment of his accession that he would have to devote his exclusive attention to purely political and dynastic problems. France, under Henry II, once more tried to make good her claims in Italy. The ensuing war between France and Spain lasted from 1557 to 1559. France lost in Italy, but captured Calais from England, Spain's ally by virtue of the marriage of Philip with Mary Tudor. Mary's reign constitutes the Catholic interlude in the English Reformation, and the loss of Calais broke the spirit of the doughty queen, who died in 1558.

The war was ended by the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis, which concludes the long struggle between Spain and France begun in 1494. It allowed Philip freedom to embark upon the series of religious wars which fill the rest of his reign. The peace left Spain still supreme in Europe, the Empire still intact. The war might have been prolonged indefinitely had not both crowns been seriously threatened by internal troubles.

Philip turned to the Netherlands, where he left his half-sister, Margaret, as regent. Protestantism was taking root there and Calvinism particularly was popular in the northern provinces. Philip's efforts to suppress it with the Inquisition and similar methods served only to arouse hostility. The inhabitants of the Netherlands disliked Philip in person and on national

grounds, for he was a Spaniard first and always. His attempts to curb political privileges of the cities and the nobility, and his increase in taxes made him further unpopular.

The revolt of 1565, breaking out only after futile attempts to obtain justice by peaceful means, took on a religious character. The Dutch were secretly encouraged by Prince William of Orange, "the Silent," their chief object being the abolition of the Inquisition and the attainment of local autonomy. The outbreak was temporarily successful, and a bit mad. It awakened Philip to the seriousness of the Dutch situation, and his resolve to crush Protestantism without compromise strengthened. The revolting Dutch and Flemish thereupon resolved on independence.

William of Orange, and after his death his brothers and sons, led the revolt. The Dutch gave no quarter and asked none. Philip's governors and generals—Alva, Requescens, Don John of Austria who had defeated the Turks at Lepanto, Alexander Farnese—all between 1565 and 1598, had ultimately to acknowledge defeat. To the Dutch the word seemed unknown. In 1609 Philip III—for Philip II had died in 1598—was forced to sign a truce tantamount to independence. Actual independence came in 1648. However, the independence was only for the northern half, for just as the north was Dutch or Teutonic and the south French or Walloon, so

the north was Protestant and the south Catholic, and it is to be said to the credit of Alexander Farnese that he saved the south (later Belgium) for Catholicism and Spain. But the north formed a Protestant Dutch Republic under the famous House of Orange and rose to play a part second to none in seventeenth-century Europe.

In the course of his battles with the Netherlands, Philip tried in every quarter to stem the rising Protestant tide, only to add to his antagonists. He lent his aid to the Catholic element in France, particularly when the French throne passed to a Protestant king. He succeeded in annexing Portugal, which again became independent in 1640. But his doom was sealed when Elizabeth of England was finally drawn into the conflict on the side of the Dutch. Philip concentrated his forces against her and climaxed his efforts by sending out the "Invincible" Armada to meet Elizabeth's ships. The defeat of the Spanish fleet in 1588 was one of the turning points in modern history, for it marked the beginning of the definite decline of Spain and the emergence of England as a major sea-power.

Philip II, then, had failed in his great ambition to stem the tide of Protestantism. The Spanish sun was setting. The Netherlands had achieved their independence religiously and politically. Both England and France were clearly powers of the first rank. The Catholic

Reformation had lost its most militant supporter.

When Henry II (1547-1549) signed the peace of Cateau-Cambrésis he turned to his own pressing internal problem—the Huguenots, Frenchmen who had come under the spell of Calvinism and who numbered some 300,000 by this time. Henry's sudden death "left France at a critical period with a triple problem—the character of the monarch, the direction of policy, and the challenge of Calvinism to the dominant Roman Catholic Church." The Huguenots took up arms. They were joined by those nobles who were jealous of the Catholic contenders for the throne, the family of Guise. Between these two parties stood Catherine de Medici, widow of Henry II, with three sons, each in his turn entitled to the throne. War was inevitable. Again it was a politico-religious struggle following rather closely a Protestant-Catholic division. The steps of the conflict or succession of conflicts it is bootless to trace. Suffice it that in 1589, after a terrifically devastating internal disturbance, order was restored by Henry of Navarre, who took the throne as Henry IV, the first Bourbon king. Crowned a Huguenot, Henry, to insure the unity and peace of his nation, returned in 1598 to the Catholic fold with the words, "Paris is worth a mass."

To insure peace Henry promulgated the Edict of Nantes (1598), granting to Huguenots al-

most unprecedented religious and civil liberties. The Catholic was the national church, but the Protestant Huguenots were guaranteed liberty of conscience, the right to hold services in certain cities, the right to hold civil offices, and were given control of certain fortified towns. The edict brought a temporary lull in the conflict, but the situation was anomalous and impossible.

When Henry IV was struck down by an assassin in 1610, leaving an heir of nine years and another Medici regent, circumstances augured ominously for a repetition of the civil and religious wars. At a crucial moment in her history, France was saved by one man, Armand Jean du Plessis, known to history as Cardinal Richelieu.

There seemed to be something paradoxical about the man who during the regency worked himself into the councils of state, and who, when the nine-year-old boy reached man's estate and took his crown, became the king's chief adviser. He wore the red hat of a Cardinal, yet he opposed the forces of the Counter-Reformation unceasingly. There was reason for this. Richelieu probably stands just over a great divide in the history of men's loyalties. The ecclesiasts of note before him unfailingly placed devotion to Church above loyalty to country. But Richelieu was first a Frenchman and then a Catholic. And Richelieu stands as a symbol of the hope of a universal and cosmopolitan Catholic Church sub-

merged in the rising tide of nationalism. Hence, he threw his forces against Spain and the Catholic leadership because Spain was the *national* enemy of France. If necessary to the greater glory of France—and to the weakening of the Habsburgs—Richelieu would ally himself with Protestants or infidel Turks against the powers representing his Church. In this he is typical of the usual course of French diplomacy and statecraft modeled on Machiavelli.

At home Richelieu left no stone unturned to solidify the French nation and build up a strong central government. He foreshadowed the absolutism of Louis XIV. He allowed Huguenots their civil and religious rights granted by the Edict of Nantes, but he destroyed those political rights—of holding fortified towns, etc.—which would endanger France. By putting his influence against their private duels and fortified castles, and by building up a strong central administrative system responsible to the crown and executed throughout the realm by commoners, he clipped the wings of a powerful nobility. Domestically, Richelieu must be credited with another important achievement: he succeeded in making unnecessary the calling of the Estates General, an institution partially representing the nation and constituting a potential check on the king's power. This assembly had convened in 1614. Largely through the influence initiated by Richelieu, it did not meet again until 1789.

In international affairs, Richelieu's ruling ambition was to see France the victor over the House of Habsburg. To this end he threw France, at an auspicious moment, into the Thirty Years' War.

The Peace of Augsburg (1555), a temporary settlement of Germany's religious upheaval, contained certain ambiguous clauses. Altho it allowed Protestants to retain all Catholic properties seized before 1552, it said nothing about those taken afterwards. There was, too, the question of Catholic prince-bishops who turned Protestant: Were their holdings to go with them or could the Catholic Church appoint a new prince-bishop to take title to the lands? Finally, whereas the Augsburg treaty provided that princes, and hence their people, might choose between Lutheranism and Catholicism, there was no provision for Calvinists or other Protestant sects. The wonder was that peace under these conditions could be maintained at all.

The war that broke out in 1618 was precipitated by Bohemia's striking for independence from the Habsburg Empire. Bohemia, under Hussite and Lutheran influence, was Protestant; the Empire was Catholic. The revolt immediately divided the Germanies, and then all Europe, into two armed camps. The Catholics in Germany were stronger than the Protestants, and had it not been for outside intervention the German Reformation might have been arrested

in the seventeenth century. But Protestant Europe, notably Denmark first and then Sweden, was determined to make its own the war against the Catholic Hapsburgs. And, still motivated by the ambition to glorify France in every possible way, Cardinal Richelieu finally entered into the fray on the side of the Protestants—and not without reward.

The Thirty Years' War or Wars divide themselves into five periods: the Bohemian Period (1618-1621), the Palatine Period (1621-1623), the Danish Period (1625-1629), the Swedish Period (1630-1635), and the French Period (1635-1648). In the sequence it may be seen how the struggle assumed an increasingly wider international character.

Only the terrible effect of the course of the war need be noted here. It strangled Germany for generations to come. The destruction of property was unparalleled in the history of warfare; cities and towns were wiped out and the land reverted to a wilderness, while the population decreased by over one-half.

The war closed with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 tho the Franco-Spanish war went on until 1659 and the Baltic struggle until 1661. Its effects on Europe and the religious question may easily be gathered by scanning the provisions of the treaty of peace. In Germany the individual prince, as provided in the Peace of Augsburg, was still allowed to choose his reli-

gion—this time Calvinism was included as one of the choices—and the people in the princes' realm had to conform within three years. On the property question all possessions in the hands of Protestants or Catholics on January 1, 1624, were to remain so possessed. Each German prince was granted sovereign authority to make war or peace without the consent of the emperor—the Holy Roman Empire survived the Thirty Years' War as a mere shadow. Certain internal territorial settlements were made in Germany. Sweden received important territorial additions. France got Alsace—except Strassburg, a free city. Brandenburg made extensive gains in Pomerania. The independence of the Dutch and the Swiss was recognized.

The Peace of Westphalia left supremacy in the north to be fought out between Sweden and the rising state of Brandenburg-Prussia, and left France the dominant power in Europe. The House of Habsburg, in both its branches, saw its dreams fade. Germany was prostrate. The religious antagonists had only learned that bloodshed was useless, that part of Europe would remain Catholic, part would be Protestant. Toleration had not arrived, but henceforth widespread persecution at least was no more, and the religious wars came to an end. The Protestant Reformation stood; the Catholic Reformation produced a Church purged, and far more worthy

than at the height of the Renaissance to call herself the Bride of Christ.

The Renaissance phase of European history is finished. The European man has definitely emerged from passive childhood to active youth. The transition, if soul-wracking, at least affirmed that the European, having discovered himself, the past, and the world, was willing to risk with magnificent virility his own strength in the canny playing of the game with destiny.

XVI

THE ABSOLUTE MONARCHY

THE political phenomena of the period from the end of the stormy Reformation in 1648 to the beginning of the equally turbulent French Revolution in 1789 are broadly as follows: first, the development of the absolute monarchy, with kings and emperors in fact insisting that their authority was divinely ordained, and the concomitant manifestation of such an interest in the welfare of their subjects as to label them *benevolent despots* and their time as the era of *benevolent despotism;* second, in England a break in the development of the absolute monarch and a counter-development, with far-reaching results, of a constitutional monarchy in which the king was subject to the will of the elected representatives of the people, or a part of the people; and third, certain momentous conflicts at arms which were to result in important territorial changes not only in Europe but throughout the world.

Political development from the Middle Age through the Renaissance was marked by the evolution of the strong monarchy made possible by the gradual weakening of the power of feudalism, due in no small part to the alliance for national advantage of the newly-risen towns

with the king. The king gained strength, too, from the decreasing influence of the international Church, and from the gradual upbuilding of a feeling of nationalism among his subjects.

The trend towards strong monarchy in several European countries went on uninterruptedly in the era following the Renaissance phase of European history, and in the course of the seventeenth century the autocratic state reached its logical completion in the absolute monarchy.

The absolute monarch is perhaps most completely exemplified by Louis XIV, who inherited the throne of France, a boy of five, in 1642. Two able ministers, Richelieu and Mazarin, both cardinals of the Church, had removed the last obstacles to Louis XIV's assuming, when he took the reins of government in his own hands in 1661, the full prerogatives of a monarch with absolute power, and as such he guided the destinies of his country until 1715.

Richelieu's contributions—the crushing of the political power of the Huguenots, the subjection of the nobility to the throne, and the discontinuing of the Estates General—we have noted. He was succeeded at his death in 1643—his king, Louis XIII, died at almost the same time—by Cardinal Mazarin, who was chief minister to the queen, Anne of Austria, regent for the child king, Louis XIV. Mazarin's great work consisted, in the first place, in suppressing the parlement of Paris in a civil war known as The

Fronde, in which the parlement attempted certain reforms which would have made France a constitutional monarchy. Mazarin's second achievement was the aborting of Spain's final effort to challenge French supremacy.

The way, therefore, was cleared for Louis XIV to step actively into his kingly rôle in 1661 with no person or faction to brook in the slightest his unlimited royal power. He was not unaware of his rôle. "I am the state," is said to have been his boast. He vowed he would be his own prime minister. The sun he chose as his emblem, because, in the words of Mr. Ferdinand Schevill, "he was pleased to imagine that as the earth drew its sustenance from the central luminary, so the life of France emanated from his person." He ruled, he believed, by Divine Right; he was responsible only to God, and to him God had given authority over the destinies of France, and the loyalty of his subjects to their king was to be something akin to their devotion to God himself. In keeping with his exalted position, he built for himself and his court a magnificent royal city at Versailles, southwest of Paris. There is perhaps nothing in Europe so lavishly splendrous. Louis's court at Versailles became the envy and the model of his princely contemporaries.

He filled well the rôle of absolute monarch. Former feudal lords became but his satellites, accoutrements of the luxurious court at Ver-

sailles. Dependent neither upon Estates General nor upon parlements, he collected his revenues and spent them as his wishes or whims decreed. He completed the system of central administration initiated by Richelieu; a military and naval force was under his control, as were the courts of law. Royal administrators collected taxes and constructed and maintained the public works. France, long before Louis XIV's time, had gained the privilege of nominating bishops and abbots; Rome could control him only spiritually.

Louis's absolutism, however, was not merely pomp and ceremony. He worked hard and was conscientious in his practise of the "trade of a king." Before he became immersed in wars of his own making, Louis, with the assistance of extremely able ministers, did much for the improvement of France; his interest in French welfare during the first part of his reign justly places him among the benevolent despots.

Seldom has any monarch been blessed with such an able coterie of ministers. Lionne built up a foreign office and diplomatic staff second to none in Europe. Louvois, minister of war and father of modern military organization, recruited and supported the finest standing army —regulated, disciplined, efficient—the world had ever seen. Under him was an unexcelled military engineer, Vauban, whose fortifications were the proud bulwarks of French defense. But, all things considered, the ablest of Louis's lieuten-

ants was Jean Colbert, holder of practically every important peaceful office in the government, but primarily minister of finance.

Colbert, by way of comparison, can be said to have possessed the combined financial virtues of Alexander Hamilton who economized by increasing revenues, and Albert Gallatin who balanced budgets by the most rigorous savings. He installed a system of accounting, and by this and the elimination of misappropriations he turned deficits into surpluses. But this was not enough. The national wealth must be increased. He promoted agriculture, manufacture, and commerce. He improved public works. Colbert furthermore subscribed to the theory of mercantilism,[1] exploitation of colonies for the sake of the mother country; he purchased new colonies, encouraged settlement in old ones, and built a navy. His particular application of the theory of mercantilism came to be known as "Colbertism." Much of Louis's patronage of the arts was encouraged by the able minister. Colbert gave new impetus to the French Academy, founded by Richelieu, established the Institute of France, built the famous observatory at Paris. Writers, artists, and scientists, many of them attracted from foreign lands, were under his patronage. And he was responsible for numerous architectural structures of the period.

[1] More will be said of mercantilism in the following chapter.

There is one dark blot on the domestic reign of Louis which must be examined before we turn to his wars. In 1685, after persecutions and outrages brought about by the influence of Catholic clergy, Louis revoked the Edict of Nantes, taking away from the Huguenots, now numbering a million, their civil and religious rights granted by Henry IV and affirmed by Richelieu. The outrages committed against them and the revoking of their rights caused Huguenots by the hundreds of thousands to emigrate from France to other countries. What was England's, Holland's, Prussia's, and America's gain was France's irreparable loss.

But Louis was not satisfied with unsurpassed absolutism at home. Of what use his power if it could not be vaunted before all nations? Visions of world empire rose before him like a dream. "Accordingly," writes Mr. Ferdinand Schevill, "he formally inaugurated a career of conquest which, after a few brilliant results, led to such a succession of disasters that the man whose early actions had been attended by clouds of incense wafted by admiring courtiers, closed his career under a deepening shadow."[2]

But until 1667 and for some time thereafter, Louis was the quintessence of absolutism. All over Europe he was envied and copied. The vogue of pompous but relatively efficient and benevolent despotism swept the Continent.

[2] *A History of Europe* (Harcourt, Brace), p. 319.

Altho the era from 1648 to 1789 is known as the Age of the Absolute Monarchy, its more significant political contribution was the counter-development in England of the constitutional monarchy—a form which, when copied, and modified chiefly by the elimination of the monarch and the extension of suffrage, was to result in constitutional democracy.

The question immediately arises: Why did not the English people tolerate an absolute monarchy in which the French seemingly acquiesced? The revolt against absolute despotism in England was led by the middle classes of the towns when they felt the king was not giving them their just dues. They were stronger than the same class in France because commerce and industry had moved ahead faster in England than on the Continent. They were a force to be reckoned with also because many of them had adopted Puritanism, a very liberal type of Protestantism. This threw them in direct opposition to the Stuart kings, who were religious conservatives. Puritanism, too, was more than a church sect. It was a movement for personal and social reform. Politically, it championed the fuller rights of the people. It was characterized religiously by the theology and morality of Calvin. Let us examine the evidences of the English development.

We have noted in connection with the development of strong monarchy that a degree of ab-

solutism was welcomed in England under the Tudor monarchs from 1485 to 1603 as an antidote to civil and feudal wars and as a guaranty of security to the nation. But the Tudors were discreet rulers, and while they were in fact almost absolute, they never insisted on the theory of absolutism, i.e., that they ruled by divine right. Of course, certain jealously guarded English constitutional rights predate the reign of the Tudors. Magna Carta (1215) had come to be thought of as embodying not only feudal but natural law. Parliament's right to tax; freedom of speech for members of parliament; parliament's right to legislate; habeus corpus; trial by jury—all these were recognized constitutional rights before the battle of Bosworth. And it is to be noted that in all their absolutism the Tudors never repudiated these rights; they simply abrogated them. They even pretended the use of old forms. Parliament's main hold over the monarch had always been money; the Tudors were economical, collected taxes, seized church property, and tampered with the currency. Parliament was not often needed to make new grants.

But Elizabeth, last of the Tudors, was succeeded in 1603 by James VI of Scotland, son of Mary Stuart. Henry IV called him the wisest fool in Christendom. There may have been conviction but very little wisdom in his insisting

that the king ruled by divine right and that no one could oppose him.

It is not our purpose to trace in detail the constitutional development in England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; the general trend can be observed. James I by his theory of divine right, by antagonizing English Puritans, by being extravagant and trying to coerce parliament into granting him money, and by other stretchings of his assumed prerogatives, aroused the opposition of parliament and the country, particularly middle-class Puritans. James was succeeded by his son Charles I. Charles married Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis XIII of France; she was a Catholic, and Charles secretly promised Louis that English Catholics would enjoy certain leniencies. This and his inherited devotion to the theory of divine-right monarchy early assured his unpopularity.

The conflict between king and parliament continued. Charles's first parliament limited the levy of customs duties to one year instead of establishing it for the whole reign as heretofore; and it assailed the Duke of Buckingham, the king's favorite. The third parliament of his reign refused to grant subsidies until he signed the Petition of Right (1628), in which he promised not to levy taxes without parliament's consent, not to quarter his soldiers in private residences, and not to infringe on other rights. The assassination of Buckingham forestalled trouble on

that score. From 1629 to 1640 Charles ruled without parliament. To raise money he resorted to various devices, even old feudal customs. For unconstitutional practises he secured the consent of his appointed judges. In religious matters, through William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, Charles opposed the Puritans directly by reintroducing into the Anglican Church Catholic practises and dogmas and by insisting upon uniformity. When he attempted these extreme measures against Scotland, rebellion resulted; the Scots deposed the king's bishops. To obtain financial aid necessary to suppress the Scotch rebellion, Charles called parliament again; it dissolved in three weeks, accomplishing nothing. The Scots advanced on northern England. Charles as a last resource in 1640 summoned a new parliament, which, because it lasted until 1660, has been called the Long Parliament.

If the death-knell of divine-right monarchy had not already been sounded, the Long Parliament did it. The Long Parliament abolished the special tribunals set up to punish political and ecclesiastical offenders. It eliminated all irregular means the king had used to raise money. To prove the right of parliament—and in this case of the Commons, which now claimed unusual authority—to impeach ministers of the king, Archbishop Laud and the Earl of Strafford were sent to prison. But the most radical

thing this parliament did was to resolve that it could not be dissolved without its own consent; it furthermore passed the Triennial Act requiring that parliament should be called at least every three years. No longer could kings rule without parliament.

How rebellion arose against Charles, how parliament without regard to constitutional practise took matters in its own hands, the beheading of the king, the protectorate of Cromwell—all these developments have interesting phases, but add little concretely to the evolution of constitutional monarchy. Suffice it to say that, tired of the excesses of fierce Puritanism, England wanted her king back in 1660. Charles II was recalled.

He promised to respect constitutional privileges and not to tamper with religious policy. On this latter score he and his brother, James II, both sympathetic to Catholicism, got into particular trouble. They also insisted on the divine-right theory of their ancestors. Under Charles II parliament abolished the last vestige of feudalism. Charles was a spendthrift; parliament grew thriftier and claimed in 1665 the right to grant money for specific purposes and to demand an accounting of expenditures.

On the religious side Charles was particularly high-handed, but parliamentary opposition matched him. He tried to suspend laws oppressing Roman Catholics (also Dissenters) but

failed. Parliament divided itself into Whigs and Tories—two parties. The Whigs tried to exclude Prince James from the throne because of his conversion to Catholicism; the Tories tolerated the prospect as preferable to civil war. The Tory view prevailed and James II succeeded his brother in 1685. An avowed Catholic, he united opposition to himself when, after the birth of two Protestant daughters, he married a second and Catholic wife, who bore him a son. England was definitely anti-Catholic, and the prospect was too much. Mary, James's eldest daughter and an Anglican, had married William of Orange. William and Mary in 1688 were invited to take the throne in order "to save the liberties and religion of England." James II fled to France.

But parliament took no chances about the "liberties and religion of England." It passed on December 16, 1689, a Bill of Rights incorporating promises made by William and Mary when they took the throne. The Bill of Rights is the great document in modern English constitutional history. It provided against infringements by the king on parliament's power; it denied the king's right to suspend laws or dispense particular persons from obeying laws; it declared that no tax was legal without parliament's consent; free election of members to parliament was insured; the king could impose no unusual punishments; it also, together with subsequent en-

actments, insured that parliament must meet at least once a year. The Bill of Rights, moreover, regulated succession to the throne, and required the sovereign to belong to the Anglican Church. With the Bill of Rights was passed the Toleration Act, conceding non-Anglican Protestants the right of public worship. By provision of the Bill of Rights the crown passed in 1702 from William and Mary to Mary's sister Anne, and in accordance with the Act of Settlement (1701) from Anne to her cousin, George I (1714-1727), the son of Sophia of Hanover. In 1707 England and Scotland were united under the title of the Kingdom of Great Britain.

The further curbing of the monarch's power in the period of the early Hanoverian kings undoubtedly arose from the circumstance that these German gentlemen couldn't speak English and therefore paid not much attention to parliament and its doings. The handling of government business was in consequence left to a small group of ministers, the cabinet, which was responsible not only to the king but, as a practical matter, to the leading party in parliament, because the king found that it was most convenient to choose his ministers from the dominating party in parliament. The cabinet was really an "inner circle" of the old Privy Council which had advised with the king in important matters. William had allowed the cabinet a fairly free rein, and the Hanoverian kings didn't at-

tend cabinet meetings at all; thus the cabinet gradually became responsible only to parliament.

The responsibility of the cabinet increased during the era of Whig rule under George I and George II, made possible because the Tories favored a Stuart restoration. Sir Robert Walpole, leading Whig, held office for twenty-one years and became known as "prime minister." And so parliament, which had already curbed the power of the king in England by arrogating to itself the authority to legislate, now controlled the ministers who executed the legislation. The hopes of absolutism in England were nil.

All this constitutional development did not, however, mean democracy in eighteenth-century England, because even the elected House of Commons was chosen by but one-tenth of the male population, the percentage then enjoying the franchise.

We have now surveyed these two counter-developments in Europe following 1648: the absolute monarchy typified by France; the constitutional monarchy as developed in England. That in the world conflict which occurred almost simultaneously with these developments France suffered loss and England enjoyed gain, is by no means wholly attributable to their contrasting types of government.

We left Louis XIV in 1667 basking in undisputed absolutism but determined under the influence of his war minister Louvois on a career

of conquest. Hostilities began in 1667 and lasted to 1678. First Louis fought Spain to secure the Spanish Netherlands, but took only a strip. He then fought Holland, who, after flooding him out of Amsterdam, found allies in Spain and in a number of German princes. Louis got Franche Comté from Spain. By diplomacy he obtained Strassburg, completing the possession of Alsace. And in 1684 he was at the height of his glory. But his money was giving out, and the wars of conquest had created enemies and a coalition headed by William of Orange. Spain, Austria, and various German states joined Holland, and when William was called to England in 1688 he had no difficulty in persuading her to join the coalition. Louis's third war and the first in which England and France are the chief enemies ended in 1697. The results are of little significance.

The question now arose of the succession to the Spanish throne occupied by Charles II, who had neither children nor brothers. One sister was the wife of Louis XIV; the other was married to the Emperor Leopold, heir of the Austrian Habsburgs. If either Louis or the emperor annexed Spain and all her possessions, the balance of power in Europe would be destroyed. And William of Orange, after 1688 also William III of England, was for one unwilling to see the balance destroyed. Louis realized this, conferred with William, and the two agreed to a plan of

partition of Spain and her possessions which apparently preserved the balance of power. But before the Spanish king died he willed his kingdom and empire to Louis's grandson, Philip of Anjou, on the express condition that his possessions would never be divided. Louis weighed caution against ambition but chose the will and repudiated the plan of partition. It meant war with Austria and most likely with England. War soon came. The War of the Spanish Succession broke in 1701 and almost all Europe before it ended took part: England, Holland, Austria, Brandenburg, Portugal, Denmark, and Savoy against France, Spain, and Bavaria. William III died in 1702 knowing the war would be successfully prosecuted by his sister-in-law, Anne, England's queen until 1714. Hence in America, where colonists of the combatants fought, it is known as Queen Anne's War. It was a world struggle.

Louis was defeated. Strong support at home and dissension among his opponents somewhat mitigated the failure. The Peace of Utrecht, 1713-1714, concluded the war. Louis's grandson, becoming Philip V, got Spain on the condition that the crowns of France and Spain never be united. The Austrian Habsburg emperor got the Spanish Netherlands and Spain's Italian possessions. The Dutch received a string of forts on the French border. The elector of Brandenburg was recognized as King of Prus-

sia. Savoy, a duchy, was made a kingdom and given to Sicily. England came out best, receiving from France—in America—Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and Hudson's Bay. Important for her Mediterranean trade were the Island of Minorca and the Rock of Gibraltar which she acquired from Spain.

In 1715 Louis XIV died. He had seen a glorious France, over which he held absolute sway, impoverished and weakened by a series of wars fought to satisfy his ambition for conquest. On his deathbed he said to his great-grandson, "Do not imitate me in my taste for war"—but Louis XIV had learned his lesson too late. He had, however, made France the artistic and intellectual center of its day.

But the world conflict went on. To understand the factors of its continuance a brief survey must be made of certain European developments between 1648 and 1789 outside France and England. Two other powers, Russia and Prussia, had begun to raise their standards aloft, and a third, Austria, took a new lease on life. Russia and Prussia in the earlier portion of the period constituted a challenge to Swedish control in the Baltic region, Sweden having become dominant there by the Treaty of Westphalia. The rise of Russia was largely due to the work of Peter the Great (1682-1725) of the Romanov dynasty, who had traveled and studied in Europe with the purpose of making Russia a

Western state and of bringing his country into the concert of Europe.

Charles XII (1697-1718) of Sweden foolishly attempted to conquer Poland. Russia and Prussia thwarted the effort and Sweden paid. Prussia got Swedish Pomerania, freed East Prussia from Poland, and in 1701 became a monarchy with the Elector of Brandenburg as its king. Peter the Great got the eastern Swedish provinces with an opening on the Baltic Sea, and there built his great capital of St. Petersburg, and near by, with the aid of a French architect, built his Versailles in imitation of Louis XIV. It was, too, his "window into Europe." He had now his opening on the Baltic; he also wanted an outlet on the Black Sea, but this accomplishment was left to Catherine the Great (1762-1796).

In 1740 Frederick II, called "the Great," became king of Prussia, a Prussia centralized and enlarged and strengthened by his Hohenzollern ancestors in the hundred years preceding him. He added greatly to their contributions. In the same year there had come to the throne of the Austrian Habsburgs an almost equally capable monarch, Maria Theresa, empress by the grace of the Pragmatic Sanction, a document by which her father Charles VI, last of the male line, had insured the throne's passing to her by consent of his own dominions and the powers of Europe. Frederick wanted Austrian-controlled Silesia. He stepped in to take it and with interested

allies started the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748) to strip Maria Theresa of her inheritance. In the beginning she fought alone against Prussia, France, Spain, Bavaria, and Saxony. Frederick received Silesia, but Maria, tho temporarily losing her possession, obtained the aid of allies; Holland and England, to restore the European balance, joined her. It is to be noted that England and France are again at war. The War of the Austrian Succession ended with the Peace of Aachen in 1748. Maria regained her throne but lost Silesia. Regarding England and France there were no results save a restoration of conquests and a postponement of colonial issues.

France and England had become in the eighteenth century rivals not only on the Continent but in colonial expansion in India and North America, hence in the next and greatest conflict of the century, the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), the issue between these two powers was colonial rather than continental. Spain of course fought with France. The line-up of the other powers changed: Prussia this time joined with England against Austria and France. Russia joined the latter alliance. England and France fought for the supremacy of the seas and of America and the Indies; Prussia and Austria for the control of Germany.

By the Treaty of Hubertsburg (1763) Frederick the Great was confirmed in possession of

Silesia. Prussia and Austria after 1763 stood as strong rivals in the Germany hegemony and the end of the Holy Roman Empire was inevitable. By the Treaty of Paris (simultaneous with the Treaty of Hubertsburg) England received from France in America the St. Lawrence Valley, all territory east of the Mississippi River, and the island of Grenada in the West Indies. Spain ceded the Floridas to England. France gave Spain the Louisiana territory. And England took over the French empire in India. As an empire builder Great Britain emerged from this series of wars mistress of the seas; Britannia had begun to rule the waves. And France was temporarily exhausted; she could blame no one more than Louis XV, weak successor to the Grand Monarch.

We have described the absolute monarchy as it was exemplified in France, and noted its counterparts in Prussia, Austria, and Russia. We have traced the counterdevelopment of constitutional monarchy in England. We have followed a world conflict which marked the decline definitely of Spain, temporarily of France, but which saw the rise of Russia, of Prussia, and Austria, and which assured to England ascendency on the waves and dominions beyond the seas. There remains to be considered in the period from 1648 to 1789 what we may broadly call the Intellectual Revolution. To that chapter we now turn.

XVII

THE INTELLECTUAL REVOLUTION

We have seen in our survey of the political development of Europe from 1648 to 1789 that it was an era dominated by absolutism, modified in England by the evolution of constitutionalism. The personification of absolutism was the absolute monarch who put forward the arrogant claim that his authority was unquestionable because it was divinely ordained; he was invested by God Himself with complete dominion over the subjects within his realm.

A majority of these absolute rulers felt to a greater or less degree that their unlimited power carried with it a tremendous obligation, a responsibility for the welfare of their subjects. Their efforts to shoulder the responsibility gave them the label of benevolent despots. "The monarch," declared Frederick the Great, "is not the absolute master, but only the first servant of the state." He acted on his belief. He encouraged industry, reclaimed waste lands, urged colonization, improved public works. In short, he was a mercantilist—because, he believed, it was a policy which would increase the prosperity of his country.

But he was more; he was a follower and patron of the enlightened thinking of his time.

Voltaire came to his court. He moved for religious toleration, for court reforms, for humanitarianism. The intellectual revolution, which we now consider, was undoubtedly made possible in some degree by the sympathy of Frederick and similar benevolent despots for new ideas.

And new ideas there were! We speak to-day of the triumph of science, but while our science, widespread as are its effects, is chiefly an instrument for bettering the physical condition of man, science in the eighteenth century was an instrument for offering to the mind of man an explanation of the universe in which he lived. The individual who undoubtedly did most to place science on its new pinnacle in the eighteenth century was Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727).

Newton in the year 1656 set forth in his *Principia* the law of universal gravitation, which showed that the force which causes the apple to fall to the ground is the same force which holds the stars in their courses. The universality of this force he explains in the preface to his great work: "I am," he says, "induced by many reasons to suspect that all the phenomena of nature may depend upon certain forces by which the particles of bodies, by some causes hitherto unknown, are either mutually impelled towards each other, and cohere in regular figures, or are repelled and recede from each other." Newton

did a great deal to popularize the use of what we term the scientific method of experiment, the reaching of conclusions from the observation of facts and instances.

That method resulted in other notable scientific advances in the period. Lavoisier (1743-1794), a Frenchman, was the father of modern chemistry and decomposed water into its elements. Edward Jenner (1749-1823), an English physician, discovered vaccine for smallpox. The work of the American, Benjamin Franklin, need only to be recalled. Equally important, in the field of applied science, was James Watt's invention in 1769 of the steam engine.

But the basic ideas of Isaac Newton soon radiated their influence outside the narrow compartment of the physical sciences. They had their effect in economics, politics, ethics, and even penetrated with telling results into the realm of religion. Newton had advanced the thesis, by his law of gravitation, that the universe was ordered, that it was constructed upon and followed definite and discoverable laws. It was a world-machine, this universe, and was considered synonymous with nature. As Mr. John Herman Randall, Jr., says of this eighteenth-century conception: "Nature meant, not only the world of inanimate objects apart from man, as the term is perhaps most commonly used to-day, but the whole rational order of

things, of which man was the most important part."[1]

And "the whole rational order of things" was governed by well-defined and simple laws; simple at least in comparison with the complexity of man-made society. Once these "natural laws," evidently God-given, were discovered, the secret of the universe was found. There was then left the task of making human society—that whole organization which man had so imperfectly built because he was ignorant of the laws of nature—conform to these natural laws. What conformed was reasonable or rational; what did not was unreasonable and irrational and should be at once eliminated or reformed. There is to-day the tendency to think of psychology, sociology, economics, and government as sciences just as exact in principles and methods as are chemistry and physics. Of that which we tend to believe the eighteenth century had no doubt. It entertained, as Mr. Geoffrey Bruun points out, the optimistic philosophy which held that "the emotions of the heart, the workings of the mind, the relations of society, and the business of government could be analyzed by the same method and with the same ease as the

[1] *The Making of the Modern Mind* (Houghton Mifflin), p. 274. Mr. Randall's entire discussion of eighteenth-century thought in this volume is well worth reading. Cf. pp. 253-385.

physical sciences."[1] The analysis, it was believed, would reveal the "natural laws." Further, society, a world, molded in accordance with these laws, would be reasonable, harmonious, happy. Men would in such a society live in a "state of nature," as, the eighteenth-century philosophers verily believed, men once had lived in some near-forgotten Golden Age.

To varied departments of life the thinkers of the time began to apply their theory of naturalism and rationalism. Applied to religion it struck at the fundamental faith in Christianity as decisively as the Reformation had struck at the organization of the Church. There was in this natural and ordered universe, the rationalists maintained, a natural religion. Such a religion, of course, was entirely reasonable; hence miracles, revelation, ceremonies, and even a priesthood had, indeed, little or no place in it. God, they asserted, had created a universe in much the same way as a watchmaker constructs a watch. It was constructed on natural laws; by these laws it ran. With His ordered universe God never tampered; He performed no miracles even in answer to man's prayer. Man's practise of religion, they asserted, consisted in living and striving to live in accordance with natural law, nothing more. No present-day modernist could

[1] *The Enlightened Despots* (Henry Holt), 1929, p. 6. The entire book furnishes a very lucid and extremely interesting account of the period.

be more insistent on reasonableness in religion. Such an attitude represented the rationalists' first step towards complete skepticism; the existence of a God was not denied, yet belief in the supernatural was largely repudiated. This view of religion took the name of deism.

Deism colored the thinking of such well-known personages in England as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, was actually championed by many English leaders, and was for a time an influence in the Anglican Church. That it did not filter from the intellectual classes down to the masses is in no small way due to the efforts of John and Charles Wesley and their disciple, George Whitefield, who near the middle of the eighteenth century conducted in England a popular Puritanical revival resulting eventually in the foundation of Methodism and in the starting of an evangelistic movement within the Anglican Church itself.

When deism reached the continent of Europe it gathered strength as opposition, coming chiefly from the Roman Catholic Church, increased. The chief exponent in France and in Europe of this completely reasonable religion—God the First Cause of a machine-like universe governed by natural law—was François Marie Arouet (1694-1778), known to succeeding generations by his assumed name, Voltaire. Sharp of tongue, sarcastic of pen, fearless at all times, Voltaire became acquainted with deism during a two-year

exile in England, and then proceeded to attack all organized churches with a merry sneer and ruthless logic. But he lacked not sincerity; he had been converted unalterably to the belief in Nature and Reason which had sprung from Newton's science. "The only gospel one ought to read," Voltaire wrote, "is the great book of Nature, written by the hand of God and sealed with his seal."

Unavoidably this rational religion, which in many cases induced complete skepticism, came into conflict with the Roman Catholic Church. Deism preached man's power to perfect himself by discovering and conforming to the laws of nature; the Church proclaimed as of old its exclusive holding of the keys to salvation. Deism stamped as unreasonable miracles, revealed religion, and all supernatural phenomena; the Church insisted on belief in mysteries like the Virgin birth, the bodily resurrection, and the changing of wine into blood as necessary to salvation. What degree of success rationalism achieved in its attacks on the Church may be judged by the fact that due largely to its influence in such movements as Jansenism, "which stressed spiritual illumination as against an excess of outward ceremonies," the powerful Jesuit order was suppressed in 1773 by Clement XIV.

We cannot intelligently consider the application of rationalism to politics unless we remember that the eighteenth century saw the middle

class gather strength increasingly. In France there had been an apparent decay of the nobility when Louis XIV built up at Versailles his notorious butterfly aristocracy. It is to be remembered, too, that he adhered to the policy initiated by Richelieu in selecting government officials from the commoners, who, like the king but from different motives, were antagonistic to the nobility. In England, after a thorough middle-class revolution in 1649 and a subsequent reaction, the rising business men in the towns had with permanent effect united in a compromise with more politically intelligent landed gentry in the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688.

The significance of the action of 1688 was made clear to the Continent in no small degree through the work of its great political apologist, John Locke (1631-1704), already mentioned in connection with deism. In writing his apologia Locke was undoubtedly influenced by the scientific universe governed by natural law which his contemporary, Sir Isaac Newton, had set up. In his *Treatise on Civil Government* (1689) Locke showed this influence in starting the study with a consideration of what man's condition was in a "state of nature" where, of course, natural laws operated perfectly, but where man, altho sociable and happy, was undeveloped and incomplete. He concluded that: "The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges everyone, and reason, which is that law,

teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions." Hence Locke derived his celebrated "natural rights": life, liberty, and property; and the greatest of these, according to him, was property. It is an interesting commentary on the humanity of Thomas Jefferson that in the American Declaration of Independence he substituted for "property" the broader inalienable right of "the pursuit of happiness."

The purpose of government in a civil state, Locke logically concluded, was to guarantee so far as possible the preservation of these natural rights. The government and the ruler at its head, he believed, derived power not from divine ordination, but from a sort of agreement which he labeled a "social contract." In Locke's civil state the people—by which he meant property holders—surrendered those natural rights necessary for communal existence to the government in return for the guaranteed protection of their remaining natural rights, chiefly the trinity of life, liberty, and property. If the ruler failed to carry out his part of the contract, it was the people's privilege to overthrow him. Such was the apologia for the events of 1688 and a telling pin-prick to the bubble of monarchy by divine right.

France, particularly, was impressed by the spirit of Locke's thesis, and a number of French

writers showed their enthusiasm for English liberties by contrasting them with the absolutist régime in their own country. The most popular apostle—tho he contributed little that was original or constructive—was Voltaire. His rapier-like wit and biting sarcasm, his brilliance and cleverness, despite a certain superficiality, made him a colorful figure, admired, feared, and hated. He attacked all sorts of abuses, suggested few remedies, but his very brightness gave him a wide audience. With Voltaire, it has been said, France began to think.

In his revolt against the *status quo* Voltaire was not alone. A man of scarcely less moment in the agitation of the times was Denis Diderot, associate of the most distinguished scholars of the time and editor of the monumental *Encyclopedia,* a work of propaganda for radicalism as well as a library of knowledge. It appeared in 1765 with a prepublication subscription list of four thousand. Its converts to rationalism and deism were many.

However, the truly scholarly and profound study of the period in France was done by Montesquieu, lawyer, student, and thinker. For confirmation of current ideas he sought the sanction of history. He concluded in his work, *The Spirit of the Law* (*L'Esprit des Lois*), that there was no single perfect form of government, but that every people works out the system best adapted to its own needs. He is the author of

the well-known principle of "checks and balances" among the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of government which prevails in the Constitution of the United States.

In their consideration of political government the enlightened thinkers could not, of course, neglect the all-important fiscal function of the state. Economic welfare of the people was of the very essence of good government; hence, quite naturally, certain groups of thinkers applied the popular theories of rationalism and natural laws to the field of economics with conclusions not inconsistent with those reached regarding matters political. Since the rise of the strong monarchy the prevailing economic system of the state had been mercantilism. The major premise of that system, since both kings and subjects desired above all things wealth in order to increase the power and glory of the state, was that all efforts should be bent towards securing for the state an abundance of bullion, gold and silver. This involved a whole series of minor premises: the importation of gold and silver was to be favored and their exportation prohibited; exports should exceed imports that there might be a surplus of bullion; manufacture was to be encouraged; colonies were to be utilized as sources of raw materials and markets for finished products; ocean-borne commerce was to be carried exclusively in native ships.

What answers were the economic rationalists

to give to such a principle? The natural-laws argument was again produced. Economics, like every other social and physical science, was governed by fixed principles. To interfere with the operation of these laws, as the state was doing under a mercantilist policy, was wrong and injurious. Hence, the government should in no wise interfere with private enterprise. *Laissez-faire* (let alone!) was the slogan of the enlightened economic group who called themselves physiocrats.

The great champion of physiocracy was the Frenchman, Quesnay, who had a wide following. A somewhat different slant to the theory of *laissez-faire* was given by the Scotsman, Adam Smith, who in his *Wealth of Nations,* published in 1776, the year of American independence, advocated the removal of all restrictions on trade and individual enterprise. Adam Smith was the economic apostle of the middle class as John Locke had been its political apostle. The protection of property, free and untrammeled business operations—these advocated reforms when realized could not but raise to a commanding position the trader, the shipper, the manufacturer, and all their retinue. And the middle class soon came into its own.

The fitting climax to a chapter on the Intellectual Revolution is Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). In the inclusiveness, the extent, and the color of his revolt, he stands alone. Strangely

enough—and yet as regards a theory of government it is perhaps not strange—this prophet of democracy came out of the same city in which John Calvin reached fame. Rousseau himself was a pathological case. Unable to make a respectable living, immoral, untruthful, fretful, he became in his last years actually insane; but all that need not influence our judgment of his contributions.

During an age when reasonableness and human perfectability through the accomplishments of men's minds were stressed and stressed again, Jean Jacques Rousseau was one of the few who did not forget the emotions of the heart. In *La Nouvelle Héloise* (1759), in *Emile,* and in other works he pointed the road back to feeling, to instinct, to love, love of things of the senses as well as of the works of the mind. Green fields, babbling brooks, the color of sunset, the beauty of a woman, the handiwork of God—all these Rousseau looked upon and said they were good. And he became the father of the romantic movement: a recognition, especially manifested in literature and art, that man was ruled not so much by the cold and austere judgment of the mind as by the throbbing pulsations of the heart.

To give way to all these impulses required a return to a state of nature, an admittedly imaginary entity with Rousseau. But when he sketched ideal government in such a state, he, with his contempt for dry intellectualism, went

in his *Social Contract,* farther than his contemporaries. Locke, who never rejected limited monarchy and who never thought of any sovereignty beyond a propertied class in his social contract, is completely overshadowed by Rousseau. Listen to Jean Jacques:

> The institution of government is not a contract, but a law; the depositories of the executive power are not the people's masters, but its officers; it can set them up and pull them down when it likes; for them there is no question of contract, but of obedience; in taking charge of the functions the state imposes upon them they are doing no more than fulfilling their duty as citizens; without having the remotest right to argue about the conditions.

Rousseau died in 1778. When, fourteen years later, a republic was established in France, Jean Jacques Rousseau was not forgotten. But the rule of a popular majority did not prevail; until the nineteenth century the middle class was to be in the ascendancy.

XVIII

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND NAPOLEON

SPURRED on by Voltaire's vehement attack against the abuses of the times and his insistence on applying reason to existing institutions, and fascinated by the picture of the sovereignty of the majority painted by Rousseau, the French people, it became evident in the latter half of the eighteenth century, would tolerate but little longer the oppression of absolute Bourbons.

Louis XIV, who died in 1715, was succeeded by his great-grandson, Louis XV (1715-1774). Under the latter monarch absolutism had become increasingly unbearable. The long colonial struggle with England had drained the treasury. The system of taxation favored a useless nobility and wrought misery on the common people. Versailles, the magnificent royal residence, reveled in more and more luxury and became, in addition, the seat of an almost continuous voluptuous orgy. Headlong towards destruction rushed king, mistresses, and butterfly nobles. "Things will hold together till my death," shrugged Louis XV. "After us the deluge!" affirmed Madame de Pompadour, official mistress.

Death came in 1774, and a grandson, Louis

XVI, mounted the throne, a lad of twenty, well-meaning perhaps, but irresolute. His queen, Marie Antoinette, eighteen and charming, was the daughter of Empress Maria Theresa of Austria. Louis recognized the sad state of affairs, tried to reform it, and failed. His first move was good; he dismissed his grandfather's ministers and called Turgot, an able economist and anti-mercantilist, to clean up the financial situation. Turgot initiated splendid reforms, but his death-knell was sounded when he sought to abolish special privileges and to relieve the abuse of the common people by adopting a uniform tax policy. The privileged classes—all those who profited by abuses—turned against him. The king was too weak to stand by his appointment, and Turgot, who might have saved France a revolution, was in 1776 dismissed.

The financial problem still demanded solution, and the king appointed for the purpose Necker, native of Geneva and a successful Paris banker. By thrift and economic efficiency he reduced the deficit, but the French alliance with the American colonists in a war against Great Britain again drained the treasury. Even Necker's mild reforms angered the parasitical nobility and in 1781 he was forced to go.

In connection with the American war another cause of the French Revolution must be noted. Mr. Alan F. Hattersley contends that:

> Not only did the expenses of the war make impossible [in France] any measure of financial recovery, short of proposals which would have amounted to a revolution; but practical acquaintance with the system of democratic equality among the Americans converted French officers to the ideals of liberty and popular sovereignty. The fact that the Americans had won freedom and independence at the point of the sword, and with help from the French government, was a powerful stimulus to revolutionary thought. Down to the middle of the eighteenth century, political philosophy had scarcely touched the fringe of French society. The works of Montesquieu, Voltaire and Diderot were little read, or regarded as purely theoretical. The Americans, on the other hand, not only proclaimed, but carried into effect, the principles of social equality and the supremacy of the popular will.[1]

After the dismissal of Necker in 1781 matters in France went from bad to worse. The nation became aroused and demanded the calling of the Estates General, the old feudal assembly which had not met since 1614 and which was so dimly remembered that the dissatisfied subjects of Louis XVI thought of it as a body truly representing the nation. Pressed harder and harder, Louis yielded in May, 1789, and sent out the call; simultaneously he recalled Necker.

Popular opinion ultimately discovered that the Estates General consisted of three estates:

[1] *A Short History of Western Civilization* (Macmillan), 1927, p. 185.

clergy, nobility, and commoners. It was further discovered that by tradition they voted as units· hence the privileged orders could outvote the commoners by two to one. Protest arose and Necker ordered that the commoners should send six hundred delegates and the clergy and nobility three hundred each. The question whether the three groups should vote as units or as one assembly was unsettled. The commoners insisted on forming a National Assembly where straight majority rule would prevail; they won their point and on June 27, 1789, the three groups met in one body. Absolute monarchy in France was at an end for the time being.

The limitations of space will not permit us to give detailed treatment of the various stages of the French Revolution. We shall concern ourselves only with enough of its procedure to explain its significance. Beginning in 1789, it passed, until the downfall of Napoleon in 1815—if we consider the whole period as the Revolution—through six definite stages, the first three representing the transition to a democratic republic, and the second three a transition back to absolute monarchy. These stages were:

1. The National Assembly (1789-1791)
2. The Legislative Assembly (1791-1792)
3. The National Convention (1792-1795)
4. The Directory (1795-1799)
5. The Consulate (1799-1804)
6. The Empire (1804-1814)

The National Assembly with commoners in the majority was faced with two great tasks: since the old system was broken down when the Estates General was called, the Assembly had to operate the government during the emergency, and at the same time carry out its main purpose of drafting a constitution for France. The two tasks were not congenial. But, led by such figures as Lafayette, whose name is famous in American history, and Count Mirabeau, a born statesman, the Assembly set to work. It did not work peacefully. The anarchial element of the street besieged it. Louis and the royalist party plotted against it; as a retort to one of these plots a Paris mob stormed the Bastile, a royal fortress and state prison. The fall of the Bastile was regarded as the symbol of French independence, and the date of its fall, July 14 (1789), is a national holiday in France comparable to the American Fourth of July.

To two accomplishments of the National Assembly we must give attention. On August 5, 1789, moved by the report of a committee on disorders throughout the country, the liberal nobles voluntarily gave up their feudal privileges of game laws, exclusive right to military office, and a great variety of feudal dues. The clergy, to be not less sacrificial to country, voted to give up the tithe. The Third Estate, in its turn, agreed to give up all trade monopolies. *Feudalism disappeared from France with one*

fell swoop. Almost as a part of the same action church property was confiscated and to meet the financial crisis paper money was issued against it, which, carried to an extreme, resulted in disastrous inflation.

The second great accomplishment of the National Assembly was the drafting of a constitution, which was finished in 1791. It opened with a noble "Declaration of the Rights of Man," one of the famous democratic documents of modern times. The Declaration proclaimed that: "Men are born equal in rights and remain so"; "Law is the expression of the will of all the people"; "Frenchmen are equally eligible to public office." It also provided for jury trial, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. It justified the watchword, "Liberty, equality, and fraternity." On the side of governmental organization, the constitution made the royal executive weak. Political power was widely diffused among elected officials. A national legislature of but one house was elected every two years by citizens who qualified as property owners, a triumph for the middle class but a thorn in the side of the democratic masses. This limiting of the franchise made the Assembly very unpopular with the common people.

On October 1, 1791, the first Legislative Assembly provided by the new constitution met. The quality of its membership was impaired by a generous ordinance drafted by the National

Assembly prohibiting any of its members from sitting in the succeeding legislature. Hence inexperienced men—most of them radical orators—were given the responsibility of administering the new government. Two parties immediately arose: the monarchists, supporting the constitution, and the republicans, favoring the destruction even of the limited monarchy, and known as the Gironde. The majority followed the republican group. The power of the Girondists or republican party was confirmed when in April, 1792, the king was forced to declare war against Austria. Many nobles had left France when their cause seemed lost, and numbers of them now gathered in armed camps along the Rhine and the Legislative Assembly believed that this threat had the support of Austria; and of course monarchical Europe hated the Revolution.

Prussia allied with Austria, and in the summer of 1792 France was invaded. Republican sentiment arose. Louis XVI was held to be in league with foreign despots. "Down with the king!" was the cry. The Legislative Assembly suspended him; its ministers, led by Danton, took over the government. As practical dictator Danton rallied the forces of France and repulsed the enemy from French soil. France was saved, but not without madness, for to wipe away all possible interference Danton and his republican followers put to death in Paris during September, 1792, two thousand suspected mon-

archical sympathizers. When the king was suspended the Legislative Assembly ordered the election of a National Convention to draft a new and *republican* constitution. This body convened on September 21, 1792.

The National Convention began its career with France freed for a time from invasion. Republicanism was coming into its own, and the Convention was determined not only to secure liberties in France but to become, in Danton's exalted cry, "a general committee of insurrection for all nations." France was going to convert the world to its gospel of "liberty, equality and fraternity."

The direction the Convention was to take had to be decided in another conflict of parties. Against the Gironde, which supported republicanism but repudiated violence or massacre, stood the Mountain (so called because members of the party had the highest seats in the convention hall) supporting republicanism without humane qualification. Led by Danton, Robespierre, and Marat, the Mountain swung the majority and prevailed. Its first act was to condemn and behead the king; Louis XVI died January 21, 1793.

This act coalesced monarchical Europe against the Convention; England, Spain, Austria, and Prussia joined forces. Before war could be prosecuted the Mountain had to subdue entirely the Gironde. This was accomplished June 2, 1793.

Unchecked now, the Mountain moved to rid France of her enemies in systematic fashion; Robespierre's Reign of Terror was immediately instituted. The Reign of Terror, as well as the effort to overcome France's external enemies, was under a strong executive group, the Committee of Public Safety, made up of twelve members with plenary powers.

The bloody story of the Reign of Terror, which lasted from June 2, 1793, to July 27, 1794, can be but summarily recounted here. During fourteen months some fifteen thousand executions took place. Queen Marie Antoinette was a victim along with many other notables. Merest suspicion was ground for sentence to the guillotine. The City of Lyons, opposing such violence, revolted; the army of the Convention practically razed the city. Toulon, likewise in revolt, surrendered to the English. The skill of a young military officer regained it; his name was Napoleon Bonaparte. Terror finally seized the Convention, even the Mountain itself. His own colleagues united against Robespierre, and he and his fellow terrorists were condemned to death July 27, 1794. The Reign of Terror ended.

It must be admitted that under the rule of the Mountain, France's defense was successfully organized. Credit is due chiefly to Carnot, who conscripted armies even amidst the Reign of Terror. The preliminary preparations bore fruit in 1794. Belgium was conquered; Holland was

seized. Favorable peace was made with Spain and Prussia. This done, the Convention could settle down to its main work of writing a new constitution.

The document was completed in 1795. This Constitutional Convention reversed the policy of its predecessor and declared that two-thirds of the new legislature must be made up of men who had sat in the Convention. Monarchists who had arisen in the reaction against terror resented this self-perpetuating measure and resolved to storm the Convention. They were stopped by a whiff of grape-shot fired by troops commanded by the same Napoleon Bonaparte whose skill had regained Toulon.

The new instrument of government, called the Constitution of the Year III (a new calendar had been set up starting from the year of the execution of the king—when the French Republic was born), had as its main feature the establishment of a strong executive body of five members, called the Directory. The legislature was bicameral and was to be elected by property holders; again the middle class triumphed. And authority replaced violence.

From 1795 to 1815 the history of France is largely the biography of the young lieutenant who had regained Toulon and later saved the National Convention. Napoleon Bonaparte, who was born in Corsica in the year 1768, was but twenty-five years old at the time of his Toulon

triumph; before he was thirty he was the foremost man in France and but a little later he was a figure who towered over Europe like a fearful giant. Napoleon was one of the greatest military geniuses in the history of warfare and one of the greatest civil rulers in the annals of nations and empires. He was a tireless worker with an unrivaled memory even for details. Perhaps his magnetism, his power over men, was his most valuable characteristic; thousands died for him gladly even tho he was among the most unscrupulous of persons. As one commentator has said, he must have answered some lyric cry in the human heart. "Morality," he admitted, "has nothing to do with me." Judgments about him differ. He has been called an "imperial impersonation of force and murder"; it has been said that of the supremely great men only Christ and Napoleon acted out their dreams instead of dreaming their actions.

There is little in the circumstances of his birth or in his early life to explain this genius. His family was of noble lineage. Corsica in his youth was intensely patriotic, trying to throw off French control. At ten young Bonaparte entered the royal military school at Brienne. He graduated in due time as a junior lieutenant of the artillery in the army of a people who were suppressing his native Corsica. Who knows whether the spirit of the French Revolution

or personal ambition caused him to cast his destinies with France?

For his defense of the National Convention the Directory rewarded Napoleon with the command of a small army in Italy, which was to completely overshadow in achievements two larger French armies sent into Germany. When in 1797 he concluded his campaign in Italy, substantial territorial gains were added to France, and Napoleon was a hero. In 1797 the Directory exulted in France's virtual possession of Belgium, Holland, Italy, and the Rhine boundary. Of France's enemies only Great Britain remained in the field. Bonaparte in 1798 with the consent of the Directory tried an attack in Egypt as a threat to England in India. But Admiral Nelson destroyed the French fleet, and left Napoleon stranded with an army in Egypt. Napoleon deserted his army and returned to France, where the people, not comprehending his Egyptian defeat, hailed him as a savior. He came in time; a new coalition of Austria, Russia, and England was threatening from without, and corruption, bankruptcy, and hopeless confusion reigned within. There was talk of a royal restoration. Instead the people turned to Bonaparte. With ease he overthrew by a *coup d'état* the Directory and had himself made First Consul in a government practically concentrated in his hands. The Consulate lasted from 1799 to 1804.

Napoleon's achievements during the rule of

the Consulate merit attention. By 1802 the coalition was quieted. Russia withdrew in 1799 and Austria was defeated the next year, confirming France's possession of the left bank of the Rhine and securing her in Italy. England was too inaccessible to conquer, so a treaty was concluded with her in 1802 on the basis of mutual restitutions. France was to remain at peace until ambition again stirred Napoleon's aggressiveness. Meanwhile his work on the domestic situation was notable. Indeed his internal reforms, not his military successes, remain as his best monuments.

We can but summarize briefly this great work. He resumed specie payment, giving impetus to sound business. He centralized governmental control and introduced administrative efficiency; a people torn by confusion welcomed it even at the cost of the ideal of democracy. Napoleon turned next to religion and restored Catholicism out of a tangle which had resulted from confiscation of Church property, the attempt to establish a national church, and such extreme efforts as the setting up during the Revolution of first a worship of Reason and later Robespierre's cult of the Supreme Being. But the reestablished Catholicism, confirmed by a treaty with Rome in 1801 called the Concordat, was closely dependent on the state, which nominated and paid priests and bishops whose appointments were confirmed by the pope.

We may pass over his attempted educational

reforms to make mention of his revision of the law, which, under the direction of juristic experts, resulted in 1804 in the *Code Napoléon,* the first broad systematic codification since the days of Justinian. It became the basis of law for a goodly part of Europe. Napoleon recognized its importance, and after his downfall declared, "Waterloo will wipe out the memory of my forty victories; but that which nothing can wipe away is my Civil Code. That will live forever."

With his domestic reforms well under way, Napoleon stood at the parting of the roads. He chose to follow the course of the Cæsars, and placed above the welfare of France the satisfying of unbounded personal ambition. It is not without significance that Ludwig von Beethoven, during the time when Napoleon was First Consul, admiringly dedicated to him the Third Symphony, only to change the title to "Sinfonia Eroica, composed to celebrate the memory of a great man," when he heard that Bonaparte had made himself emperor.

The steps towards this realization were easy. In 1802 Napoleon was made consul for life. In May, 1804, he assumed the title of Emperor of the French. Six months later, in the presence of the pope, he crowned himself emperor. The cycle was complete: France had passed from absolutism to limited monarchy, to republicanism, to oligarchical control, and back again to absolutism

—and the whole process took but a decade and a half.

It will not serve our purpose to trace in detail Napoleon's imperial course from 1804 to 1814. In 1805 the French troops crushed an Austrian army at Austerlitz in Moravia. In 1806 the Prussian army was routed at Jena and the French troops entered Berlin. In 1807 a Russian army was defeated at Friedland; in 1809 the Austrian defeat was confirmed at Wagram; in 1812 a former Russian alliance was broken and a half-million troops marched on Moscow only to perish in a wintry retreat.

The territorial additions to France were many. The Papal States were added in 1808. In the same year Madrid was seized and Spain became a subject-kingdom under France. Napoleon's relatives occupied thrones. Against Great Britain, unconquerable because of her navy, a blockade was tried which only destroyed commerce and brought unpopularity to the emperor. Weakened by Spanish uprisings and the loss of an army in Russia, Napoleon faced in 1812 the forces of his encouraged enemies. The Germanies arose against him. English troops advanced under Wellington in Spain. In 1814 the anti-French allies marched into Paris. Napoleon abdicated and was exiled to Elba, a small Mediterranean island, only to stage a triumphal return to power which was finally quelled at Waterloo.

With Napoleon's defeat certain, there occurred in Europe a conservative reaction in which all the forces of the ancient régime—divine-right monarchy, feudal classes, clergy, and nobility—hoped again to enjoy the ascendency. For Napoleon in the eyes of Europe had stood for the Revolution, the triumph of the middle class. That this group received a temporary setback was natural; that they would rise again was inevitable.

Out of this melodrama of the French Revolution and Napoleon, what remained? The right of property, preached by the early apostles of the middle class, was established. If not religious freedom, at least a modicum of religious toleration prevailed. Napoleon, by applying his Code throughout Europe, guaranteed equality before the law. Feudal forms were abolished, and their inequalities were never restored. And nationalism, invigorated by the contagious patriotism of Frenchmen, swept over Europe with telling consequences for the nineteenth century.

XIX

NATIONALITY AND DEMOCRACY

When we survey the years from 1815 to 1914 we find that this century is dominated by two great developments: (1) The growth of nationality and democracy, twin offspring of the French Revolution, and (2) the Industrial Revolution, dependent upon the growth of scientific knowledge.

We shall study these in separate chapters, and in the first of the two will note the development of those two ideas, nationality and democracy, which run like two threads through the many and complex phenomena of nineteenth-century Europe. To show the complete evolution of these ideas as reflected in the events occurring from 1815 to 1914 would require a much larger book than this entire volume; we shall attend only to salient currents.

It must never be forgotten that the seeds of these nineteenth-century growths, nationality and democracy, were sown by the French Revolution. It had emphasized the idea that the sovereignty in any government is with the people, which develops a consciousness of nationality while promoting democracy. France had developed a national army, a soldiery imbued with the sentiment of protecting and glorifying

France. And the armies which successfully opposed France were those in which a national spirit had developed. So, to a far greater degree than was realized in 1815, there had arisen among various groups a desire for democracy and a consciousness of nationality. From 1815 to 1914 democracy developed chiefly in England and France (and in America), but far more widely the idea grew that each nationality—people of the same customs, language, and traditions—should constitute a separate state.

The Congress of Vienna, which met in 1814 and 1815 to settle the consequences of the Napoleonic wars, failed, quite naturally in its spirit of reaction, to take into consideration the principles of nationality and democracy. Rather, the four great conquerors: Austria, Russia, Prussia, and England, were animated by two entirely different principles: legitimacy, the reestablishment of all states as they had existed before 1792 in the hands of their "legitimate" rulers, and division of spoils among the conquerors as rewards.

We need not here go into the detailed divisions of Europe made in 1815. Some of them we must take account of. France retained the boundaries of 1790 and had to pay a small indemnity. Louis XVIII, a surviving Bourbon, was put on her throne. Prussia, supported by Russia, nearly caused a war in trying to get Saxony. As buffer states against France, Holland and Belgium (the

Austrian Netherlands) were consolidated under the House of Orange and called the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and Genoa was given to the king of Sardinia. The republic of Venice—and of course republics had not belonged to legitimate rulers—was given to the king of Sardinia. Austria received the republic of Venice, compensating her for the loss of Belgium. Great Britain received her reward in colonies: Heligoland, Malta, Ceylon, and South Africa. Russia got most of the Polish territory, altho Austria and Prussia took their share.

But most interesting from the viewpoint of our study of nationality and democracy are the handicaps which the Congress of Vienna placed on these two movements. In the matter of disregarding the principles of nationality the Congress sinned against the Belgian, Polish, Italian, and German peoples.

The Belgians were placed under Dutch rule in total disregard of their nationalist wishes. The Poles were indiscriminately distributed among Austria, Prussia, and Russia, with Russia getting the lion's share. The Italians were tossed in all directions: Austria received Lombardy, which now included Venetia; the State of the Church was given back to the pope; Tuscany went to a branch of the Habsburgs; Piedmont plus Genoa went to the king of Sardinia; Ferdinand, a Bourbon, was given Naples and Sicily —all this diffusion not to mention the division

of the lesser states of Italy. The Italians were soon dominated by Austria. Germany had been reduced by Napoleon to thirty-eight sovereign states. After Napoleon's fall German national leaders asked that these states be made into a close federal union, but the Congress of Vienna, dominated by Metternich, the Austrian Chancellor, a conservative with ambitions of his own stead, a confederation called the Bund was formed, which was futile as a means of effective union.

Nationalistic ambitions were apparently quite effectively thwarted at Vienna, but they would not down. Belgium gained her independence as early as 1831. Poland had to wait until after the World War. Italy and Germany we shall discuss later.

The Congress of Vienna, befitting its conservative and monarchical tenor, also took steps to insure Europe against any democratic or liberal movements. The Congress formed two alliances, one, the Holy Alliance, a sentimental agreement drafted by Tsar Alexander and signed by his colleagues in which with mystic phrases they agreed to rule their subjects according to Christian principles.

The second alliance is important. Starting first as a Quadruple Alliance but made Quintuple by the admission of France in 1818, it dedicated itself in the interests of peace and security to see that not one iota of a change was

to be made in the arrangements dictated by the Congress of Vienna. What a damper on progress, particularly towards democracy, when divine-right monarchs were again in the saddle! Not only boundaries but the internal governments of European countries—lest dread revolution again break out—were to be maintained at the *status quo*. That such a condition of affairs could not long exist was obvious.

Unified states based on the principle of nationality did emerge and democratic governments did arise despite the suppressions of the Vienna Congress. Space will not permit an inclusive survey; we shall consider the triumph of the principle of nationality in Italy and Germany and the ultimate success of democracy in France and England. We turn to the unification of Italian peoples into the Kingdom of Italy.

Before 1852 the Italians' efforts to free themselves from Austria were of little avail except to center hopes of unification around Sardinia-Piedmont, which had become a constitutional monarchy under King Charles Albert, who after defeat by the Austrians in 1849 abdicated in favor of his son, Victor Emmanuel II. In 1852 a brilliant statesman was appointed head minister of Sardinia. To Count Cavour must go the chief credit for liberating and unifying Italy. He was determined to drive the Austrians from the peninsula, and to establish a northern kingdom of Italy under Victor Emmanuel, a liberal

monarch, as the first step towards national union.

To do this he patiently enlisted the aid of Napoleon III, nephew of the famous Corsican and now emperor of the French, against Austria. Obtaining Napoleon's aid necessitated Sardinia's siding with France in the Crimean War, and the secret promising of Nice and Savoy to Napoleon in return for French help. But in 1859 France joined Sardinia against Austria. For various reasons Napoleon made an early peace and Sardinia received only a part of Lombardy. But wild nationalistic feeling, greatly stimulated earlier in the century by the writings of the patriot Mazzini, swept over Italy, and despite the original failure, Tuscany, Parma, Modena, and Romagna (the northern section of the Papal States), rose against their princes and begged for annexation to Sardinia. Napoleon's consent to the annexation was secured by cession to France of Nice and Savoy.

Cavour turned to the south. To the two Sicilies he sent the colorful soldier, Garibaldi, with an army. At once the people revolted against their Bourbon king, Francis II. The demonstration was repeated in Naples, and in 1860 Sicily and Naples voted to join the northern kingdom. Anconia and Umbria (eastern territories of the Papal States) followed suit. Garibaldi wished then to attack Rome, held by French troops, but the cautious Cavour interposed a veto. In

1861 Victor Emmanuel II proclaimed himself King of Italy, and in the same year Cavour died. But unification went on. Victor Emmanuel in 1866 received Venice as a reward for his aid to Prussia in a war against Austria. The French troops left Rome during the Franco-German War of 1870, and the soldiers of the Italian king marched in. The pope withdrew to the Vatican palace. Except for Trentino and Trieste, which Italy received in 1919 after the World War, Italian unification was completed in 1870. Italians had given their answer to the non-recognition of the principle of nationality by the Congress of Vienna.

The German answer was equally decisive. German unification, like the Italian procedure, was largely the result of the statesmanship of one man, Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898), who became prime minister of Prussia in 1862. And Prussia was the natural leader in unifying Germany: she emerged from the Congress of Vienna comparatively free among non-German peoples; the Napoleonic Wars had brought about internal reforms; she was the head of the *Zollverein*, a German customs union. The great obstacle was Austria, who, having won in 1815 the agreement to a loose German confederation, had to be ousted from the German situation. Then Germany could be merged into Prussia. To oust Austria required war; Bismarck, exponent of blood and iron, soon found the occasion after

insuring the friendliness or neutrality of other European powers.

Schleswig and Holstein, German-inhabited provinces belonging to Denmark, had the opportunity in 1863 of breaking away from that country with German support. Bismarck persuaded Austria to join him in the effort, knowing that the differences over spoils would give him the coveted opportunity of eliminating Austria from the German situation by force of arms. Schleswig and Holstein were quickly taken in 1864. By 1866, after Bismarck had formed an alliance with Italy, the war against Austria was on, apparently to decide the issue of the disposition of Schleswig and Holstein. The real issue was the reorganization of Germany on a more solid basis than the Bund, product of 1815. The war was over in seven weeks, with Prussia as victor and the mistress of Germany. Schleswig-Holstein came definitely under her control and she annexed the northern states she had occupied during the war: Frankfort, Nassau, Hesse-Cassel, and Hanover. A North German Confederation dominated by Prussia was formed to displace the old Bund.

Outside the Confederation were four detached states in the south: Bavaria, Württemberg, Hesse-Darmstadt, and Baden. Bismarck bided his time until an opportunity should arise to bring these states into the fold. It came shortly and proved to be that best of all instruments for

cementing national feeling—a war. For some time and because of various matters, relations between France and Prussia had been strained. The climax came when Spanish revolutionists, having deposed their queen, asked a Hohenzollern prince, a relative of King William of Prussia, to take the throne of Spain. The prince refused, but the French foreign minister through his ambassador foolishly insisted that King William promise that his relative would never renew the candidature. William refused and Bismarck capitalized the situation by publishing the demand. France, feeling insulted, rushed into war. Would the four south-German states support Prussia? They did, not only because a defensive alliance required it of them but more because the strain and break with France had excited a strong German nationalistic feeling.

German forces without great difficulty won the Franco-German war of 1870 and the German troops returned home to find a greatly intensified national feeling. The oneness of North and South was confirmed in the formation of the German Empire in 1871, which was further enlarged by the cession to it of Alsace and Lorraine as spoils of the war. Bismarck had won and the principle of nationality had prevailed.

We may note in passing that nationalist movements sprang up, and to a large degree triumphed, all over Europe in the nineteenth and in the early years of the present century. We

have mentioned that Holland and Belgium became separate kingdoms in 1831. The Balkan states, with Greece taking the lead in 1829, gradually gained their freedom from the Turks. Norway and Sweden became separate kingdoms in 1905. It took the World War to make possible the realization of nationalistic ideals in Austria-Hungary and Russia.

Let us now follow another principle of the French Revolution, that of self-government, democracy, as it developed in the nineteenth century despite the efforts of the Congress of Vienna to suppress it. What transpired in France itself? It will be remembered that in keeping with the legitimatist policy of the Vienna agreements a Bourbon, Louis XVIII, was placed on the throne. His government, a mild constitutional monarchy, largely because the franchise was based on wealth, represented a triumph of the middle class. Louis XVIII's successor, Charles X, who ruled from 1824 to 1830, attempted a policy of reaction consistent with Vienna principles and brought upon himself the Revolution of 1830. This action brought to the throne Louis Philippe, a member of another branch of the Bourbons, who ruled until 1848 and whose aim was to maintain a rule of the middle class.

The Revolution of 1848 was a strongly liberal uprising. The Industrial Revolution, which we shall discuss in a subsequent chapter, had pro-

duced a working class, many of whose members exhibited socialistic tendencies and were discontented with the limited political franchise. A Provisional Government was established which represented a compromise between moderate republican and socialistic factions, and which agreed to recognize the "right to work" and to accept the socialist proscription of national workshops. But a National Constituent Assembly elected by universal manhood suffrage turned out to be moderate and abolished the workshops and defeated a subsequent socialist insurrection. The weakness of the extreme republican movement was exhibited when the nation chose as president Louis Napoleon, nephew of the great emperor. In 1851 Louis, by a *coup d'état*, made himself president for ten years, and in 1852 was elected emperor by a plebiscite. France was again in reaction against republicanism.

For fifteen years the empire pursued an absolutist policy. Freedom of the press was limited, political meetings were forbidden, and universal male suffrage was abridged to the extent that the whole body of workingmen was deprived of the vote. The policy of the empire was welcomed because it suppressed anarchy, attained some glory in war, and because the country enjoyed prosperity. From 1867 to 1870 the empire gradually became liberal, largely for the reason that Napoleon III had to offer his subjects something to appease their dissatisfaction at the failure of

his foreign policy, particularly at his failure to wring from Prussia annexation which would secure for France the Rhine boundary.

Jealousy of Prussian or German ascendency in central Europe eventually led to the Franco-German war of 1870, in which France was defeated and Napoleon III taken prisoner. But in the course of the war France was proclaimed a republic. Following the war a bitter fight took place between monarchical and radical factions. The radical group was defeated. But the victorious monarchical group could not agree on a monarch, and with one compromise following another, the Third French Republic was evolved between 1873 and 1875. The legislative power was vested in a Chamber of Deputies elected by universal suffrage, and a Senate elected by local departmental bodies. A ministry must command a majority in the Chamber of Deputies; hence the government is parliamentary. A president is elected for seven years by the two houses, but is largely decorative. After a decade of uncertainty the Third Republic may be described as democratic, strongly national, anti-clerical, and dominated by the middle classes, who have consistently enjoyed the favor of the electors. The Republic, too, has been liberal; there has been freedom of the press, freedom of trade unions, free state-school systems—hence the Church no longer controls education. Separation of Church and State was achieved in 1905. Therefore in

France the ideals of the Revolution have triumphed; democracy and liberalism are realities, and the principle of nationality prevails.

In contrast to France's hectic career, Great Britain achieved from 1815 to 1914 a remarkable degree of democracy without bloodshed and without overthrow of the form of government—all this despite the fact that Great Britain was and remains a constitutional monarchy. Let us follow the important steps towards democracy in the island kingdom, which, in 1688, it will be remembered, made its king dependent upon parliament, and in the succeeding century evolved a ministry responsible to the same body. Hence the development towards English democracy in the nineteenth century was a process of extending the franchise. The faction which demanded extension was the rising middle classes who had become a power as a result of the Industrial Revolution.

The political rights in England of 1815 were enjoyed by owners of landed property. Caught in the reaction of the times, the English Government made every effort to keep things as they stood. But it could not last; moderate liberalism became a rising tide. In 1828 and 1829 full civil rights were given to Catholics and Dissenters. In 1832 came a parliamentary Reform Bill which redistributed seats in the Commons sufficiently to end glaring unequal representation and lowered the franchise requirements to an extent that

the total number of voters was almost doubled. The middle classes representing growing industry were now in a position to wrest the power from the old aristocratic landed classes. In 1835 by the Municipal Corporations Act all taxpayers were admitted to town franchise. In 1867 a second parliamentary Reform Bill liberalized the franchise to include the class of skilled workers, and outside towns the property qualification was cut in half. A third bill in 1884 made uniform the borough and county franchise qualifications, the only excluded class now being the lower laboring class. In 1918 universal suffrage to men over 21 and women over 30 was granted. Britain carried the cause of democracy further by making a number of her colonies self-governing.

In the main, the lesser states of Europe, whose history we cannot trace here, followed the example of France and England in democratizing their governments. Some have become republics; some have evolved constitutional monarchies. In the nineteenth century, then, we note that in western Europe the principles of nationality and democracy, the principles of the French Revolution, triumphed despite the reaction after the Napoleonic Wars. It must suffice to say here that where the principles of democracy and nationalism were suppressed in the nineteenth century, chiefly in Russia and Austria-Hungary, the realization of these principles came as a result of the World War.

XX

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

HAD Socrates, the great Athenian philosopher who died in 399 B.C., by some miracle of earthly resurrection returned to the world of George Washington, who lived from 1732 to 1799, he would have found in man's physical environment very little that was novel. But were George Washington and Socrates to return together to the western world in the present year of grace they would be equally amazed, confused, and unoriented. Washington as much as Socrates would have to learn about and accustom himself to great industrial and commercial cities, to huge factories and mass production, to steam and electric railways and motor-driven ships, to telegraph and telephone and radio, to automobiles and airplanes, to a myriad of switches and levers, push-buttons and accelerators, instrument boards and tuning dials.

This flight of the imagination as well as probably anything else pictures the effect of the revolution in industry and science, a revolution which has virtually remade the world *and remade it largely since the beginning of the nineteenth century*. More than any other one factor it has been responsible for the momentous political changes we have just considered.

The Industrial Revolution had its beginnings in England. There is in this fact little that is accidental, for the Industrial Revolution is largely, if not solely, the product of the efforts of the middle classes, the large group which with the rise of the towns came to the fore in trade, commerce, and industry. We have noted that this group asserted its political power in England almost a century before it showed strength in other countries; in 1649 the middle classes in England deposed and beheaded a king, and in 1688 they constituted a telling factor in the Glorious Revolution and in the placing of constitutional limits on the monarch. A more significant reason for the early beginnings of the Industrial Revolution in England is that the gilds were suppressed there almost completely by the beginning of the eighteenth century while they still dominated industry in Continental countries.

This suppression of the gilds made way for personal enterprise. In England, therefore, long before it came about in other countries, men depended on their own initiative in business ventures and were in nowise hampered by the minute regulations and limitations of the gild system. This clearing of the way for the full sweep of personal initiative and enterprise in business and commercial procedure must have—and very naturally—stimulated men to call into being "that new and mysterious instrument of

the modern mind, 'the invention of invention.'" And what was the result? In the textile industry, where the need was greatest, there appeared in the half-century between 1740 and 1790 a series of ingenious devices which rendered obsolete all old processes of production in that field. Kay's flying shuttle, Hargreaves's spinning jenny, Arkwright's water frame, Crompton's mule, and Cartwright's power loom—these inventions enabled one man to turn out in the course of a day as much work as five men could do by the older methods. This increased production demanded a faster inflow of cotton, and in 1793 Eli Whitney in America perfected a cotton-gin which could pick the seeds from raw cotton faster than half a hundred negro slaves working at top speed under the crack of the overseer's whip.

But technical advancement was not limited to the textile industry. Necessity indeed is the mother of invention, and the inefficiency of operating these new machines with the motive power of man or water must soon have become apparent. The steam-engine, the invention of James Watt, which in 1769 only pumped water out of mines, was between 1785 and 1789 adapted to driving mill machinery in Nottingham and Manchester.

The steam-engine, furthermore, may be credited with a revolution of its own; it did not long remain a mere adjunct to textile manufac-

ture. In the opening years of the nineteenth century it became an all-important factor in transportation; of this Robert Fulton's steamboat and George Stephenson's steam locomotive are ample evidences. Small wonder that the nineteenth century has been called the Age of Steam! The Age of Steam was to be partially eclipsed only with the appearance of that lusty infant, electricity, which during the century was sufficiently mastered to make possible the telegraph, a transatlantic cable, the telephone, and the wireless, in the order named.

The invention of the steam-engine necessitated the more rapid production of machines and brought in turn the development of the iron trade. But iron machines gave way to steel ones when in 1856 Sir Henry Bessemer made known his process for converting iron into steel, which was followed in 1872 by the discovery of another process which permitted the conversion of the peculiar kind of iron found in Lorraine mines, the richest deposits in Europe.

Iron and coal, in fact, are so essential to machine development that industry apparently thrives on the soil under which they are deposited. Their abundance of iron and coal, indeed, seems to account for the industrial leadership before 1914 of Great Britain, Germany, France, and Belgium. The Continental countries followed England in the Industrial Revolution

as soon as the middle classes in these countries came into their own.

What were the important consequences, social and economic, of this revolutionary movement? There was, quite naturally, a tremendous increase in economic activity. The new machines marked the beginning of mass production. Surprizingly soon almost every article that man used was manufactured more cheaply and in greater quantities. When prices went down more people bought. The production of more goods and the concomitant development in transportation accelerated commerce. Those who profited by increased industrial activity grew wealthy. Fortunes before undreamed-of were made. Surpluses of wealth accumulated, to be in turn invested in enterprises for the making of more wealth.

Indeed, during the Industrial Revolution the capitalist class came into its own. It took capital in the first place to utilize the new machinery. Before the era of the machine, manufacturing was done in the home. But machines were costly; they required factories in which to house them; they needed laborers to operate them. To build factories and buy machines and pay wages required money. The capitalist rose to the opportunity. His investment was great, his profits were great. The credit system increased. Money was invested in the new projects by men who had no active part in their management—hence

the modern investment system. The means of production passed into the hands of the few who reaped its rich profits—a supercapitalist class.

Whereas the Industrial Revolution brought rich harvests to the few, it brought misery and unhappiness to the many. The capitalist class had its antipode, the great mass of workers who reaped for the time being from the new development only unrelieved misery. From the farms they came, or from their little domestic manufacturing establishments now rendered unprofitable, to be the operators and yet the slaves of these new marvelous and yet monstrous machines. Their wages were fixed, their hours of work determined, their lives almost literally handed over to an employer class. They could not assert their rights as individuals and they were forbidden to form combinations for self-protection. Low wages, long hours, unbearable living quarters; sickness, plague, even starvation—all these cast a dark shadow over the otherwise blazing Industrial Revolution.

But despite the high death-rate among the working class, caused by the conditions just mentioned, the Industrial Revolution brought with it a tremendous increase in population; there were 180,000,000 people in Europe in 1800 and 450,000,000 in 1900. The simple reason given is that the production of more goods enabled more people to live. Undoubtedly scientific advances, particularly in medicine, are also

in some degree responsible. There came also with the Revolution a shift in population from the agricultural districts to the towns. During the nineteenth century the number of European cities having a population of over 100,000 increased tenfold. How are these city dwellers fed? Science again is the answer; it has revolutionized the practises of agriculture to the point where those who migrated from the farms to the cities have not been greatly missed.

The improved means of transportation—steamboats and railways—opened up two possibilities: first, raw materials could be brought to factories from widely scattered sources; second, far-flung and hitherto inaccessible markets for the products of the factories were rendered accessible. And when the wants of the peoples of Europe were satisfied, and when the new machines continued to produce more and more, it was only natural that nations began to look beyond their own boundaries for additional markets. The Industrial Revolution thus became in the flow of time a factor of tremendous proportions in world politics. The necessity of looking for markets beyond their own boundaries started the nations of Europe on a fresh phase of colonial expansion which came to be called imperialism. When it is recalled that the three rival leaders in the Industrial Revolution were Great Britain, France, and Germany, this com-

petition for markets becomes pregnant with significance.

It cannot be too often emphasized that the Industrial Revolution, itself the product of their efforts, lifted the already rising middle classes definitely to the saddle of power, and their power was exercised in the political and the social as well as in the purely economic fields of human endeavor. Their policy was at least consistent.

Its roots are to be found in the thought of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Then it was that Sir Isaac Newton launched his ordered universe with the stars in their courses held by the same force which causes the apple to fall to the ground. Then it was that the great rationalistic group, Locke, Voltaire, and Diderot launched their blue-prints of nature and proclaimed that the natural world, the world of inanimate objects, was constructed upon and operated according to natural laws. Man, if he wished to achieve the *summum bonum* of life in this world, had only to allow those God-given laws and principles to operate unhampered and unrestrained.

When this doctrine was carried to the field of economics, its great apostle, as we have mentioned before, was Adam Smith, who advocated the removal of all restrictions on trade and industry—presumably that the universal laws might operate with freedom complete. Hence the

great cry of *laissez-faire* (let alone!). And what more natural than that these middle-class capitalists of the next century should take up the banner of *laissez-faire* and carry it wherever their influence extended? Ere we judge harshly their course of action we must realize that in their minds it was not only expedient but was ultimately founded on by no means unaccepted doctrines.

Freedom from restraint in every action was their goal. And it must be admitted that theirs was but another step—at least they thought of it as such—in that evolution of man's liberties which had been taking place century upon century, and which had given freedom from the bonds of feudalism, freedom from the authority of the Church, freedom from the tyranny of absolute monarchy, freedom from the minute restrictions of the gilds, freedom from the superimposed regulations of the mercantilist system. The individual man, at once unhampered and unaided, was to fight alone in the terrific struggle of life where the fit would survive and the weak perish. The perishing of the weak was inevitable in the rational universal scheme of things.

By uncanny coincidence this justification of the perishing of the unfit was given overwhelmingly eloquent confirmation at the very height of the middle-class supremacy, when in 1859 an English scientist, Charles Darwin, published

his memorable work, *On the Origin of Species*, embodying as one of its central theories the survival of the fittest and the perishing of the unfit in the realm of biology. The captains of industry and all their ilk could now look on the untold misery of the working class they had brought into being with no other reflection than that they were themselves the biological elect.

But the knell of the unbroken freedom of the middle-class industrialists was heard when the working class's wail of despair changed into a hymn of challenge, a metamorphosis hastened by the more sympathetic members of the middle classes who pondered on that oldest of interrogations, "Am I my brother's keeper?" The first relief which the working classes received came not from their own members, but from philanthropically-minded people of the middle class.

That oppressed and miserable workingmen would soon develop a class consciousness was inevitable. Articulate spokesmen of their cause appeared who in books and on platforms attacked the unrestrained activities of the ruling middle classes and championed instead of freedom the second principle of the French Revolution, equality, the equality of all men. These spokesmen preached, therefore, the welfare not of distinguished classes, but of undistinguished masses. To realize this goal the masses, they urged, must unite and wrest from their masters

the scepter of power. The chief apostle of this doctrine was Karl Marx, a German Jew who lived from 1818 to 1883, whose "Workingmen of all nations, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains" is the slogan, and whose *Das Kapital* is the bible of the working-class struggle for control.

The efforts of Marx and his fellow spokesmen were not without fruit. Socialism became more than a theory; it emerged into a political program taking different forms in different countries and yet having a certain international character. Naturally, socialism assumed varied shadings: there developed the right or conservative wing, like the present-day British Labor Party, and the movement extended with numerous middle positions to an extreme left wing exemplified by anarchism. In some form or other socialism became in all industrial countries a political force to be reckoned with. If a socialist party could not control a government it might at least become a pivotal minority. Of course, the first step was to gain the franchise for the working classes. That done, laborers either formed parties of their own, usually socialistic, or became potent influences in already-organized political groups. In any case the nineteenth century saw the working classes, if not in control, in a position to force the middle classes to meet some of their demands. What they gained, chiefly, was social legislation.

Space does not permit an enumeration of even the varied types of social legislation brought about in the nineteenth century through the influence of the working classes. Germany led and eventually evolved a program of insurance legislation for the benefit of laborers. Britain took a few short steps in the direction of social legislation in the first half of the nineteenth century, and before its close enacted a whole series of laws designed to better immeasurably the condition of the workingman. France's earlier record in social legislation was not so good.

Thus the very group which they had called into being effectively checked in less than a century the restricted freedom of the middle classes.

XXI

AMERICA—THE COLONIAL PERIOD

THE advent of the Americas into history is the most important phenomenon of modern times. For as far back as human records go, history had concerned itself with the peoples of the Orient and of Europe, and chiefly with those civilizations that grew up around the Mediterranean Sea. In the story of the long and toilsome climb of man from savagery to civilization, the Americas have no legitimate place. All the more significant, then, were the effects of the discoveries of Christopher Columbus and his followers upon world economy and society, politics and culture. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the rôle of the Americas in world affairs was largely a passive one; in the eighteenth and nineteenth that rôle was an increasingly active one, and in the twentieth it can be said to be a dominant one.

When Europeans first came to America they found it inhabited by copper-colored natives whom they called Indians. Something over ten thousand years earlier the ancestors of these natives had migrated from northern Asia across the Aleutian Islands and down the Pacific coast, spreading gradually eastward across the northern and southern continents. The Indians dif-

fered widely in character, in language, in social and cultural development. The majority of them remained in the primitive hunting stage; a few, such as the Mayas of Yucatan, the Incas of Peru, and the Aztecs of Mexico, had attained a high state of cultural development. It was these last with whom the Spaniards first came into contact, and so numerous and powerful were they, that they furnished the solid foundation of all later Spanish colonization in America. The Indians of North America whom the French and English met—the Algonquins, Iroquois, and Muskhogeans—were widely scattered and few in number, and in contrast to those who formed the basis for the Spanish empire, they were not absorbed but eliminated.

The background of European discovery, exploration, colonization and exploitation of America has been traced in earlier chapters. From the fourteenth century on, the rising national states of Europe were engaged in a struggle for the control of the resources and territory of the Far East and the New World. Mercantilism demanded colonies which would contribute to the wealth and power of the state. Where there was no settled population in these colonies, wealth was only potential, and it was necessary to colonize in order to secure it. This was the situation in the New World generally, and especially in North America.

Broadly speaking, the sixteenth century in

America may be said to be the century of Spain; the seventeenth century witnessed the beginnings of Spanish, French and English rivalry; the eighteenth century saw the elimination of France, and the nineteenth the elimination of Spain by the English peoples. The Spanish Empire was for long the most extensive, the most powerful, and the best administered in the New World. It included all of South America, with the exception of Brazil, which had been allotted to Portugal by the Treaty of Tordeselas, 1494; it comprised Central America, Mexico, the vast, unexplored and uninhabited region north of the Rio Grande and west of Louisiana, the Floridas, and numerous islands in the Caribbean. This vast empire was governed with extraordinary efficiency by Spain; its wealth and tribute flowed into Spanish coffers, its trade was carried by Spanish ships, and over its inhabitants, Indian, mestizo, or Spanish, was thrown the protecting mantle of the Catholic Church. And tho with the passing years the mother country was reduced from a power of the first rank to one of the third, her people enervated and impoverished, her power broken and her glory dimmed, yet the far-flung empire held almost intact until the nineteenth century.

The domains of France in the New World were scarcely less extensive, but much less powerful, than those of Spain. France had planted feeble settlements along the St. Law-

rence as early as the sixteenth century, and to these first settlements numerous others were added in the seventeenth century. But despite the paternalistic policy of the home government, the ability of French colonial leaders and the energy of the colonists, these colonies did not flourish. In the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the French Empire came to include all of Canada west to the Rockies, the territory north of the Ohio, and Louisiana—a huge, formless domain, inhabited, in 1700, by some 20,000 peasants, *coureurs du bois,* soldiers and priests. This population had increased to only 70,000 by 1763. The failure of the French to form strong permanent colonies in America can be ascribed to a number of causes, the most important of which are: the paternalistic and illiberal policy of the home government, the refusal to admit non-Catholics—thus excluding the Huguenots—and the climate and geography of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes-Mississippi River system, which had the effect of discouraging settled agricultural life and dispersing the population over an enormous region. No chapter in American history is more romantic than that which describes French Canada; no empire so vast and rich was ever held together by so puny a force, nor any more worthily served: the names of Champlain, Frontenac, La Salle, Marquette, Verendyre, Montcalm, belong to world history.

England entered upon her colonial expansion rather later than her continental rivals, but, once dedicated to empire, she soon surpassed them all. It must be remembered that the American mainland colonies were by no means the most important part of the empire: India loomed much larger on the imperial horizon than did the struggling settlements along the Atlantic coast, and even the sugar islands in the West Indies were more valuable economically and strategically to the mother country. For the empire was, at least until 1763, primarily commercial in character: it was commerce that was behind the expansion of England, that planted the settlements, exploited the resources, and provided for defense against rivals.

The causes and motives for the English colonization of America were many and varied. The economic transformation of the sixteenth century had introduced wide extremes of wealth and poverty, replaced farms with pastures, and created a large floating population that was a burden on the community and led to the belief that the country was overpopulated. The attempt of the Stuarts to assert the theory of divine right, and to root out religious dissent, made for widespread dissatisfaction. It was out from an England torn by internal dissension, by political and religious strife, that the colonies came, and tho the economic, religious and political causes of the migrations are inextricably in-

original ones: Connecticut and Rhode Island of Massachusetts Bay, and Delaware of Pennsylvania. New York, conquered from the Dutch in 1664, and Georgia, established as a frontier outpost of empire and a refuge for paupers in 1733, were from the beginning royal colonies.

If the primary purpose of those who planted these colonies was individual or corporate gain or imperial necessity, the motives of the settlers themselves were more varied. Most of those who came over from England in the seventeenth century—and that was the century of the greatest English migration—came for economic reasons. The Pilgrim colony of Plymouth was, to be sure, primarily religious, and religion loomed large in Puritan Massachusetts Bay, in the settlements along the Connecticut River, in the Narragansett Plantations that were eventually consolidated into Rhode Island, and in the Quaker colony of Philadelphia. Numbers of those who came, too, were indentured servants, and not free agents—a factor particularly important in Pennsylvania and the Southern colonies.

By 1688 the population of the colonies had reached some 200,000: about 80,000 in New England, an equal number in the Southern, and half as many in the Middle colonies. Altho negro slavery had been introduced into Virginia as early as 1619, there were at the turn of the century very few black men: the labor was per-

formed by free yeomen and indentured servants.

If the overwhelming majority of the population was English, there was already in the seventeenth century a scattering of non-English stock: Dutch, Swedish, French Huguenots, and German. In the course of the next three-quarters of a century the population grew by leaps and bounds, reaching some 1,500,000 by 1760, including over 300,000 negro slaves. The greater part of this increase was natural, but it was partly due to the fact that during the eighteenth century tens of thousands of immigrants of non-English stock found their way to the English colonies. Sturdy, God-fearing, hard-working Germans settled on the lands of the Penns and drifted southward along the troughs of the Alleghanies into Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, numbering by the middle of the century some 200,000 souls. Even more numerous were the Scotch-Irish from Ulster, scattered everywhere along the frontier, but principally in Pennsylvania and the colonies to the South. Smaller groups of Scotch, Irish, Swiss, and French went to make the American colonies something of a melting-pot even thus early.

The history of the American people, as of any individual, is the story of the adjustment of inheritance and environment. The colonists—English, Scotch, German—brought with them certain typical institutions and folk-ways, the

inheritance of European civilization. That inheritance had to be adjusted to the wilderness environment of America. This process of interaction of inheritance and environment has gone on all through American history down to the present, and given it its unique character and interest.

The institutions, the cultural, political, religious and social ideas of the American colonies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were essentially English, but certain characteristically American features were emerging. Since the principles of English liberalism were not conditioned by age-old institutions, they received wider application, and there was, on the whole, a greater degree of popular participation in the government than elsewhere in the world. There was a wide degree of religious liberty and toleration, even tho the Puritan Church was established in Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire, and the Anglican Church in the Southern colonies. There was a wider degree of economic well-being and equality than elsewhere. Because of the necessities of life in a wilderness, most men worked with their hands, and except in the South, where slavery became gradually entrenched, such work carried with it no social stigma. At the same time the more formal aspects of culture were not neglected. Churches and schools were everywhere planted, and the half a dozen colleges established before the Rev-

olution attest to the interest of the colonists in the things of the spirit. The country was overwhelmingly agrarian. There were few towns; land-ownership was general, and farms, except in parts of New York and of the tidewater South, were small.

As the best land along the coast was taken up or exhausted by unscientific farming, the colonists pushed into the interior. Migrations into the Connecticut Valley, into the uplands of New Hampshire and Vermont, into the back-country of Pennsylvania, into the Piedmont of Virginia and the Carolinas and the valleys beyond, were going on all through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. By 1760 the population of the interior—the so-called Frontier section—was as large as that along the coast. And as the economic interests of the maritime and frontier settlements diverged, as the populations differed in character and composition, and as the problems of long-distance government became more difficult, sectionalism arose. The interests of maritime New England, of New York and eastern Pennsylvania, were commercial; those of the tidewater South were determined by the staple crops of tobacco, rice, and indigo, and by the institution of slavery. In the course of time the older, more compact, more prosperous groups in the East secured control of the colonial governments and managed affairs as

their interests dictated. This development of sectionalism was ominous for the future.

The relations of the colonies to the mother country were primarily commercial, and the colonies were valuable in so far as they fitted into the mercantile system of the British Empire. The commercial relations of the empire were regulated by Acts of Trade and Navigation, acts comparable in their intent to our present-day tariff regulations. Tho the crown was steadily extending its authority over the colonies, that authority rested, on the whole, very lightly on Americans. Comparatively speaking, England allowed her American colonies a great deal of freedom and local autonomy; she also neglected them for periods, and thus accustomed them to self-government. The chief duty of the mother country toward her colonies was that of protection—against Indians, against French and Spanish rivals—and this problem was a constant one all through the colonial period.

During the eighteenth century there existed, on the whole, a remarkable degree of contentment and prosperity in the American colonies. Gradually, however, two great problems were emerging, problems fraught with danger for the future. The one had to do with the question of home rule—with the amount of supervision and regulation and interference with local affairs that the colonies would tolerate. The other had

to do with the more immediate question, Who was going to rule at home?—the question of democracy in the colonies. The development, action, reaction, and interaction of these two sets of problems form the warp and woof of the American Revolution.

XXII

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

THE period of the American Revolution, from 1763 to 1789, is one of the great creative epochs in history. Out of it came not only a new nation —the United States of America—but new political and social institutions of fundamental and far-reaching importance. The War of Independence was merely a part—a very important one, to be sure—of this great movement. What was happening was more than the emergence of a new nation; what was happening was the solution of problems of government and society; the creation of a federal system, the discovery of a new colonial system, the development of democratic institutions in State and in church, and the temporary solution of the problems of home rule and who was to rule at home. And tho the story of these years is interwoven of many strands, the whole forms a pattern of rare clarity and unity.

On the conclusion of the French and Indian War (1754-1763) England was faced with the task of reorganizing her empire. The Treaty of Paris had more than doubled England's possessions in North America, and British statesmen were confronted with problems of peace much more bewildering than those of war. They were

faced with the task of governing some 75,000 French Canadians; of defending a far-flung frontier; of crushing the rebellion of the Indian chief, Pontiac, and establishing friendly relations with the Indians everywhere; of providing for the disposal of western lands, and with a host of other scarcely less vexatious problems. At the same time they were under the necessity of tightening up on the reins of empire, of enforcing the Acts of Trade and Navigation, and strengthening the central government—all without infringing on local autonomy.

The steps of imperial reorganization that led to the War of Independence and the break-up of the empire can be disposed of briefly. The proclamation of 1763, prohibiting settlement beyond the Alleghanies; the Molasses Act of 1764, tightening up the customs service; the Stamp Act of 1765, levying what Americans insisted were internal taxes; the Declaratory Act of 1766, with its threat of parliamentary supremacy, and the Townshend Acts of 1767, indirectly regulating trade—these were the principal steps in the process. They excited widespread dissatisfaction, precipitated the formation of non-importation and other agreements, and led Americans such as Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry to formulate a political philosophy justifying disobedience and resistance.

After the repeal of most of the Townshend duties, there was for some years a lull in the

controversy between colonies and mother country. Then an ill-considered grant of monopoly on tea trade to the powerful East India Company led to the famous Boston Tea Party, December 16, 1773, and reopened the whole conflict. The British government, wearied with compromise, replied with a set of so-called "Intolerable Acts," and organized resistance appeared in the colonies in the form of the First Continental Congress. With sufficient wisdom either at Westminster or in America, affairs might have been patched up. Certainly the intentions of the English government were fair and honorable, and certainly the overwhelming majority of colonials were opposed to independence or even to open resistance.

But events got out of hand, as later events did in 1914, and the battles of Lexington and Concord precipitated an open break. With a large element in the population stubbornly loyal to the British connection, and with an even larger element indifferent, the members of the Second Continental Congress, assembled in Philadelphia, resolved to strike for independence. Their decision was announced to the world in the immortal document penned by Thomas Jefferson and promulgated July 4, 1776.

It was one thing to announce independence, another to achieve it. On the surface it seemed that the colonists were faced with overwhelming odds, but they addressed themselves to the task

with the grim determination expressed in Franklin's sage remark, "If we don't all hang together, we'll hang separately." The first problem was to achieve cooperation, and this was provided for in the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, passed early in 1777 but not finally ratified until 1781. The second problem was to organize resistance.

George Washington, wealthy Virginia planter and trained soldier, was made the commander-in-chief of the American army, and the States were called upon for aid. The ultimate success of American arms is due more to George Washington than to any other single individual. A man of rare courage and fortitude, of persistence and determination, of unimpeachable integrity, he held the little American army together during seven long years of battle, inspired his soldiers with something of his own invincible courage, conducted his campaigns with effectiveness and even brilliance, took advantage of British mistakes, and wrested victory out of a seemingly hopeless situation.

The deciding factor in the war was the alliance with France. This alliance was achieved largely through the happy diplomacy of Benjamin Franklin, of Pennsylvania, the most versatile genius of his time. The aid of France was soon reinforced by that of Spain, Holland, and the League of Armed Neutrality, and by 1778 Great Britain was faced not with a mere insur-

rection in her American colonies but with a powerful, world-wide coalition, determined to hurl her down from her high estate. The end came in 1781 when Lord Cornwallis, bottled up in Yorktown by the American army and the French fleet, surrendered. Two years later England concluded a peace recognizing the independence of the former colonies and ceding to them all the territory east of the Mississippi, with the exception of the Spanish possessions in Florida.

The achievement of independence was only one phase of the conflict. Equally important was the creation of new States, the development of democratic institutions and of a larger degree of social and economic democracy, the achievement of religious liberty, and the working out of a new colonial system. The war itself, and the breakdown of the old political bonds, furnished the opportunity for the practical application of the principles of democracy and liberty that had been voiced in the preceding years. State constitutions, embodying democratic principles, were drawn up, and the institution of the Constitutional Convention as the proper method of creating a democratic government was discovered. The slave trade was prohibited, and the institution of slavery put well on the way to extinction in the Northern States. The frontier demand for land was partially satisfied by the confiscation of crown lands and the great estates

of the loyalists and proprietors. Quit-rents were abolished, and primogeniture and entail disappeared. The Anglican Church was everywhere disestablished, and a wide degree of religious liberty and equality instituted.

Victory brought its problems to Americans in 1783 as it had to Englishmen twenty years earlier. Essentially the same questions—imperial organization, control of commerce, western lands, and Indian affairs—clamored for solution. The years after 1783—the so-called Critical Period—were years of economic depression and distress, years when it seemed that the new nation would fall prey either to the forces of internal dissension or to some hostile foreign power.

Yet during these years the fruits of victory and the democratic advances were being consolidated. And during these years, too, a new land system and a new colonial policy were being worked out. The first was outlined in the Land Ordinance of 1784, drawn up by Thomas Jefferson, and was followed in its essentials until 1862. The second was the famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which a distinguished historian has called the most important law ever passed in the New World. This ordinance provided for the admission of new States carved out of national territory, after a probationary period, on a basis of absolute equality with the original States, and, further, prohibited slavery in all the territory north of the Ohio. Had Eng-

land been willing to recognize her colonies as equals, the War of Independence might have been averted.

The chief problem of the Revolutionary period, however, remained. It was the old one of imperial order—the problem of how to organize an empire so that centralization and strength would be achieved without infringing on local autonomy. Some plan had to be found whereby the States would fulfil their obligations under Articles of Union, and yet preserve sovereignty over local affairs. England had attempted to work out a solution to this knotty problem in the years after 1763, and had failed. Americans, faced with the same difficulties, attempted to solve them in the Articles of Confederation, but these proved inadequate. It is the most signal achievement of Americans in the Revolutionary period that they finally worked out a solution to the problem of imperial order: the federal system.

The defects and inadequacies of the Articles of Confederation made it almost impossible for the new nation to negotiate satisfactory commercial treaties, or to make any provision for the payment of the foreign or the domestic debt. A period of economic depression in the years 1784-86 accentuated the difficulties of the Confederation. The outbreak of a rebellion in western Massachusetts seemed to many a portent of the approaching demise of the new nation. It

was under these circumstances that a group of determined and far-sighted men met at Annapolis to consider ways and means of saving the situation. The most prominent of the members of the Annapolis Convention were Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and George Washington. The result was a call for a convention to meet in Philadelphia, May, 1787, to "revise" the Articles of Confederation.

Twelve of the States sent delegates to this Constitutional Convention, Rhode Island alone remaining aloof. It was a matter of rare good fortune for the future of the American nation that most of the delegates were men of high caliber. From the Old Dominion came the most brilliant group: George Washington, James Madison, George Wythe, Edmund Randolph, and George Mason; Pennsylvania sent the venerable Franklin, the learned James Wilson, and the financier Robert Morris. From New York came Alexander Hamilton, from Massachusetts the able Rufus King and the wealthy Elbridge Gerry; from Connecticut William Johnson, President of Columbia College, the shrewd Roger Sherman, and Oliver Ellsworth, later Chief Justice of the United States. South Carolina sent Charles Pinckney and his cousin C. C. Pinckney, and John Rutledge; Maryland sent Luther Martin; and Delaware the famous lawyer, John Dickinson. These were the most distinguished of the delegates, and of these James

Madison and James Wilson deserve particular mention. The contributions of Washington and Franklin were primarily in the prestige their presence lent to the gathering.

The members of the Convention soon abandoned the idea of a mere revision of the Articles and proceeded to draw up an entirely new Constitution. The essential features of the Constitution they produced are as follows: it is federal in character; it applies immediately to all citizens, and not through the intermediary of the State; it possesses the necessary sovereign powers: taxation, and regulation of commerce. The question of the enforcement of laws was solved by making the Constitution the law of the land, and providing that it should be enforced by all the judges of the States. The lack of an Executive was remedied by providing for a President to be chosen indirectly. A Supreme Court with extensive powers was established, and States were forbidden to impair the obligations of contracts, to emit paper money, or to enter into alliances with other powers.

The new Constitution had still to run the gantlet of ratification. It was provided, in flagrant disregard for the Articles of Confederation, that when nine States had ratified the new Constitution it should go into effect. The struggle over ratification divided the country socially and economically. The professional classes, the merchants and traders and bankers, were gen-

erally in favor of it; the small farmers and laborers on the whole opposed. For a time ratification was despaired of. Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia were the pivotal States. Ratification was secured in Massachusetts by the influence of John Hancock and Samuel Adams, and by a series of fortunate circumstances that played in the hands of the Federalists, as those who supported the Constitution came to be called. Ratification was secured in New York largely through the genius of Hamilton and the fear of isolation. In Virginia the Federalists were successful through the influence of Washington and Randolph, and the eloquent persuasiveness of Madison and John Marshall. Had the new Constitution been submitted to popular vote it is extremely doubtful that it would have been accepted. That ratification was secured is a tribute to the far-sightedness and common-sense of the leaders of the American people in the eighteenth century.

XXIII

THE NEW NATIONALISM

THE period from the ratification of the Constitution to the conclusion of the War of 1812 was a period of the welding of the union, of the achievement of a certain sense of nationalism, of the development of democracy, and of physical expansion and material progress. When Washington took the oath of office as first President of the United States, the nation consisted of thirteen States strung out along the Atlantic coast, with a vast and comparatively uninhabited hinterland between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, and it boasted a population of approximately four million, including some half-million negro slaves. Thirty years later there were twenty-three States, the area of the country was doubled, and the population more than doubled. In these years, too, the nation had achieved a certain stability and apparent permanence, a security from foreign aggression, and a political and social self-consciousness that assumed driving force in the idea of Manifest Destiny.

It is said that when Washington read his inaugural address, his hand shook and his voice trembled with emotion. Well it might, for perilous indeed was the condition of the young na-

tion as it embarked upon its great experiment of republicanism in a troubled world. It yet remained to be seen whether either independence or union could be maintained against the forces of internal dissension and external hostility. The greatest achievement of the administrations of Washington and his successor, John Adams, is that they guided the new nation through the dangers of international politics and world war, vindicated its independence, consolidated the fruits of neutrality and isolation, and laid firmly the foundations for future political and economic development.

The first task was the formation of a government—the task of clothing the constitutional skeleton with flesh and blood. Quickly departments were created, organization developed, a judicial system established, a temporary revenue secured, and the government machinery set in motion.

The second task was the fiscal and economic one—the task of paying off the foreign and domestic debt and establishing the credit of the new government, This involved the entire economic policy of the country and precipitated questions and issues of profound and permanent significance. The financial problem came under the special jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. As a statesman-economist Hamilton was the American equivalent of the Enlightened Despot of eighteenth-

century Europe, and he hoped to develop a powerful and wealthy state by bringing to the support of the government all the propertied classes of the country. In this ambition he was eminently successful. His financial legislation included the funding of the national debt, the assumption by the Federal Government of all State debts, the establishment of a National Bank, and the encouragement of industry and commerce. All these policies were adopted against tremendous opposition from the South and the West—from the agrarian and the propertyless classes.

The third task facing the government was that of vindicating the terms of the Treaty of 1783 and formulating an American policy in foreign affairs. The Treaty of 1783 had been honored more in the breach than in the observance: the retention of the Northwest posts and the refusal to conclude a commercial treaty were particular grievances against England. After the two countries had been led to the brink of war, Washington, in 1795, sent a special emissary, Chief Justice John Jay, to London to make a final effort for peace. The result was Jay's Treaty—a treaty which averted war and secured the evacuation of the Northwest posts and the adjudication of boundary difficulties, but was completely unsatisfactory in most other respects. That ratification was secured despite widespread popular opposition was due

to the influence of Washington and the driving lash of Hamilton and his party aids.

The debates over Jay's Treaty revealed a wide divergence of political opinion in the country. The fact is that political parties were developing and were dividing on questions of foreign affairs, because the conduct of foreign affairs seemed to involve fundamental issues and principles of political belief. The outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789 and the ensuing European war had a tremendous effect upon American politics. On the one hand it diverted European nations from American affairs and left the United States relatively free to pursue its own course. On the other hand the war precipitated questions and aroused sympathies that threatened to draw the United States into its vortex. The majority of Americans, sensing in the French Revolution a struggle for liberty and democracy, sympathized with France and were correspondingly antagonistic to England. The commercial and business interests of the country, on the other hand, were favorable to their greatest customer, Great Britain. Washington wisely pursued a cource of neutrality, and steered the American ship of state safely between the French Scylla and the English Charybdis.

In the administration of John Adams, relations with France became so strained as to make war seem almost inevitable. Indeed, American

and French men-of-war fought pitched battles and preyed on each other's commerce. The danger of war and the fear of Jacobin sympathizers at home led the Adams government to adopt unwise and ill-considered measures of repression—the Alien and Sedition Acts—laws similar in their purpose to the Espionage and Alien Enemy Acts of the World-War period. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, leaders of the embryo Republican (now Democratic) party, at once directed an attack upon these harsh measures, and in the famous Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions denounced them as barefaced party measures and pronounced them illegal and void.

The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions were the opening guns in the campaign of 1800. The war scare passed away, but the party division widened and deepened. That division was not primarily over the conduct of foreign affairs. It was primarily a division between those who believed in an individualistic agrarian democracy, a frugal and limited government, and those who believed in a powerful centralized government, closely linked up with commerce, industry and finance. Jefferson was the leader of the first group, Hamilton of the second. In these two men, indeed, in their characters, their careers, and the principles they represented, are epitomized a large part of American history. Jeffersonianism and Hamiltonianism are still live

issues in American politics, and the struggle between the forces of agricultural democracy and a centralized industrial state is not yet ended.

Tho denounced as an atheist from every pulpit and as a radical from every forum, Jefferson defeated John Adams for the Presidency in 1800. Jefferson himself called this election "The Revolution of 1800," and in so far as it represented a revolution in attitude of mind, he was not incorrect. To be sure, he instituted no sweeping reforms, no radical changes, no new departures. In his eloquent inaugural address, he stated that "we are all Federalists, we are all Republicans," and announced as his ideal "a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned."

Jefferson succeeded in simplifying the government, reducing expenses and, with the aid of his great Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin, cutting the national debt in two. His first administration was a period of growth and prosperity: the year 1803 saw Ohio, the first State carved out of the Northwest Territory, admitted to the Union. In the same year Jefferson consummated the purchase of Louisiana from France for $15,000,000, doubling at one stroke the territory and potential resources of the

United States. By his skilful and moderate policies he succeeded in consolidating his own party and seriously weakened the Federalist.

Jefferson's second administration was not so happy. An attempt to curb the growing power of the judiciary met with a severe rebuff at the hands of John Marshall, greatest of Chief Justices. And the President's party leadership was threatened by the independence of John Randolph of Roanoke and his followers, the "Quids." Finally, the continuation of the European war and the flagrant disregard of American neutral rights made the maintenance of peace more and more difficult.

Despite repeated provocation, President Jefferson resisted the temptation to defend American rights by resort to arms. Instead, he tried diplomacy, and that failing, induced Congress to declare an embargo on American ships. The embargo—the modern commercial boycott—was an attempt to bring recalcitrant European powers to terms by cutting off American trade and supplies. That it failed was due partly to circumstances beyond the control of Jefferson, partly to the refusal of Americans to observe it.

Tho Jefferson failed to secure recognition of American rights on the high seas from either France or Great Britain, he did succeed in keeping his country out of a war that would have been disastrous. His successor, James Madison of Virginia, was not so fortunate. During

his administration the country drifted more and more rapidly toward war. The Congressional election of 1810 had brought a new group of men into national affairs—men chiefly from the South and the West—the so-called "war-hawks." Chief among these were Henry Clay of Kentucky, John C. Calhoun and Langdon Cheves of South Carolina, and Peter Porter of New York. These men had reached maturity since the achievement of American independence, and were intensely nationalistic and sensitive to what they felt were slights inflicted upon their country. They represented, too, the first faint glimmerings of the idea of Manifest Destiny. Their ambition looked to the annexation of Canada, of the Floridas, and of the Spanish Southwest, and their policy included the annihilation of the Indians who had terrorized the border for years.

It was this group of lusty war-hawks that pushed Madison and the country into war in 1812. New England, the one section with extensive commercial interests, was opposed to the war, and the Middle States were at best lukewarm in their support. It was the South and the West that wanted the war. The annals of that war, like those of the poor, are short and simple. The American invasion of Canada was repulsed at all points, and the United States was invaded along the Maumee, the Niagara, and the Champlain frontiers. The city of Washington was

burned, and American commerce driven from the high seas. The tiny navy alone acquitted itself with credit, winning victory after victory from the larger and more experienced opponents and inflicting tremendous damage on British commerce. By 1814, however, the overwhelming superiority of British armament had told, and even the gallant little American navy was reduced to impotence. At the battle of Put-in-Bay, however, Commodore Perry saved the Great Lakes for the United States, and in the battle of Plattsburg the greatest invading army was hurled back with serious loss. And finally Andrew Jackson's repulse of Pakenham at New Orleans, tho it came after the conclusion of peace, added immensely to American prestige and gave to the war a semblance of victory.

The Treaty of Ghent, concluded in 1815 by the American Commissioners, J. Q. Adams, Henry Clay, and Albert Gallatin, and the British, said little about the ostensible causes of the war, but recognized the *status quo*. Its chief significance was that it ended the era of American concern with European affairs and inaugurated a period of almost exclusive concern with domestic affairs and of unparalleled material and physical development. The War of 1812, unsuccessful as it was from a military point of view, had the effect of consolidating the nation and developing the sentiment of nationalism and

of unity, and of creating conditions favorable to the rise of democracy.

In the years after 1815 the tempo of American life increased precipitately, and its complexity grew correspondingly. Our concern has to do more and more with economic and social factors, and less with the purely political and diplomatic. The generation after the War of 1812 was a period of vast material development, of the exploitation of natural resources, and the significant things are not so much the things of the spirit as the things of the flesh: such phenomena as the rise of the Cotton Kingdom and the Westward Movement. Nor is there any simple and single interpretation of these years. The period is, on the contrary, one of bafflingly contrary tendencies and developments: sectionalism and nationalism, democracy and capitalism, materialism and humanitarianism, slavery and abolition, agriculture and industry, all clamor for recognition on the crowded stage of this act of our history.

The close of the war inaugurated a period of feverish material development. Already before the war the movement into the West had notably accelerated, and, gathering volume with the years, it became a veritable flood after 1815. The decline of commerce in New England and the exhaustion of farm-land in the seaboard South combined with the lure of cheap land in the West, the elimination of the Indian danger.

and the development of means of transportation and of marketing, to populate the West. From New England, from the Middle States, from the Old South, men, women, and children by the thousand plodded along the great trails into the West or, after 1816, took passage on one of the snorting monsters that plied the western waterways. The population of the new West increased by leaps and bounds; the new States of Indiana, Illinois, Mississippi, Alabama, Missouri, were admitted to the Union; land values soared, and the New West became politically articulate.

As a section the West was intensely nationalistic and intensely materialistic, and it succeeded in imposing these two characteristics upon the period as a whole. It wanted internal improvements that it might market its produce. It wanted easy money and adequate banking facilities. It wanted cheap land. It wanted a protective tariff. Its representatives in Congress, men like Henry Clay of Kentucky and Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri, were the spokesmen of these demands.

The new nationalism was reflected in the politics, the law, diplomacy, and culture of the country. A protective tariff was passed, a second National Bank established, internal improvements at State and National expense provided for. In the realm of constitutional law the decisions of Chief Justice Marshall strengthened

the power of the Federal Government and struck at the doctrine of State sovereignty. In the field of diplomacy, the Rush-Bagot agreement, the acquisition of the Floridas, and the Monroe Doctrine, announced by President Monroe in his annual message of 1823, indicated an aggressive and independent attitude on the part of the United States. And even American culture reflected the new nationalism: in art, in literature and the press, in history, and in drama, Americans were inspired by a sense of nationalism, by a new concept of the destiny of the nation.

Alongside of the movement from New England and the Middle States into the old Northwest and the trans-Mississippi regions, went a parallel movement of population from the Seaboard South into the Gulf Region and the old Southwest. In 1793 a Connecticut Yankee, Eli Whitney, visiting an estate in Georgia, had perfected a cotton-gin which made the large-scale growing of cotton possible and profitable. The exhaustion of the older tobacco and cotton lands led to the migration into new and more fertile regions, and within a few years a series of new cotton commonwealths came into existence, and land-hungry planters were clamoring at the gates of Texas. In the first half of the nineteenth century this New South, known as the Cotton Kingdom, came to develop a distinct sectional outlook—developed its own society, its own culture,

its own political philosophy. Fundamental to all these, of course, was the institution of negro slavery, upon which the Cotton Kingdom rested.

Slavery had been introduced to the colonies in the seventeenth century, but not until the eighteenth did it fasten itself upon America with any permanence. Even then it was looked upon as at best a necessary evil, and one which would eventually be eliminated. It was not until the second quarter of the nineteenth century that Southerners came to accept slavery as a positive good and to make it the corner-stone of their system. The institution itself was, on the whole, a remarkably humane one. It was a transitional process through which the African negroes passed on the road from savagery to civilization. Because each slave represented a considerable investment, it was merest business sense to treat him with intelligent care and consideration. The burden of slavery rested, indeed, much more heavily upon the slave-owners themselves than upon the slaves, who were for the most part contented with their lot.

Nevertheless, the very existence of the ownership of man by man aroused resentment in some sections of the country. In the eighteenth century Virginia had furnished the opposition to slavery. In the nineteenth century the Abolitionists, as the more extreme antagonists of slavery came to be called, were for the most part from New England. Men like William L.

Garrison, the poet J. G. Whittier, the orator Wendell Phillips, the statesman J. Q. Adams, the journalist Elijah Lovejoy, were the most prominent among the Abolitionists. This group, at no time very numerous or powerful, was vociferous in its unrestrained denunciations of slavery and the South, and forced the South to come to the defense of its peculiar institution.

The Abolitionist crusade in the North was merely a part of a world-wide humanitarian movement. It was a period of reforms in every camp—of idealisms, of enthusiasms, of Utopias. The old Calvinistic theology was giving way to a more liberal religion. Internationalism and world-peace movements were gaining widespread support. Dorothea Dix led a movement for the reform of asylums and the treatment of the deaf and dumb. Prison and penal reforms were making headway in many States. Woman suffrage gained converts and labor organizations were formed. In the realms of thought and literature the reform movement was reflected in Transcendentalism, an optimistic philosophy whose leading figure was Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Some of these reform movements were called forth by the development of industrialism and urban life. The United States had always been primarily agricultural, and it remained so until after the Civil War. But the years after the embargo and the War of 1812 witnessed the rise of manufactures in New England and the Middle

States. Along with this went, inevitably, the growth of cities and the appearance of those evils almost invariably associated with urban life. And in the decade of the thirties immigrants from Ireland poured into these eastern cities by the thousands, and in the forties and fifties these were joined by other thousands of Germans.

The rise of the new West, the growth of cities and industrialism, and the development of new humanitarian ideas, gave a decided impetus to democracy in America. Tho in the old, slave-holding South the tenets of democracy were being repudiated, they found lodging and support in the North and the West. The principal manifestations of the new democratic spirit are to be found in the constitutions of the New States with their broadening of the suffrage. In national politics democracy found expression in the elevation, in 1829, of Andrew Jackson to the Presidency.

Jackson, the first really popular President of the American people, personified many of the characteristics of Americans of his generation. He was a Westerner, and represented Western frontier democracy. He was a thorough going nationalist, and fought the forces of disunion that appeared in the South during his administration with unrelenting vigor. He combated privilege wherever he saw it—in the banking and industrial circles of the East, in the Su-

preme Court, in the slave-holding aristocracy of the South. His presidency may be said to close one era in American politics and inaugurate another. With Jackson new issues appear; the Texan question, the slavery controversy loom ominously on the horizon. New men take command: Webster, Davis, Douglas, Walker. Political parties perfect their organization and the Whig party comes into existence. Union and Democracy, the dominant characteristics of the preceding period, are both put on trial.

XXIV

CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION

THE years following Jackson's presidency were years of almost unprecedented expansion, years when the continental limits of the nation were rounded out. This territorial expansion and the political and economic problems precipitated by it occupy the front place in the historical annals of these years. They were years, too, of the beginnings of modern America—the beginnings of the economic, industrial, scientific, and agricultural revolution that was so greatly accelerated by the Civil War.

The story of territorial expansion, enormously significant as it is, can be disposed of briefly. Ever since the decade of the twenties Americans had been filtering into the broad, fertile fields of Texas, which was still under Mexican rule. In the thirties the infiltration became something approaching a flood. Failing to secure a satisfactory degree of local autonomy, and reacting from the oppressive measures of a far-distant government, the American settlers of Texas organized, revolted, and in 1836 established an independent republic.

There followed immediate efforts to secure annexation to the United States, efforts that met with decided opposition from elements in

the United States as well as from Mexico, which still refused to acknowledge the independence of her rebellious province. Annexation became a major issue in American politics, Southerners and Westerners generally favoring the step, New England and anti-slavery men everywhere opposing it. It was only after ten years of agitation, and not until the election of Polk to the presidency in 1844 revealed the will of the people, that annexation was actually accomplished. By joint resolution of both houses the State of Texas was incorporated into the Union, March 3, 1845.

Such action could not be taken without affronting Mexico. Yet it was not annexation, but a boundary dispute that eventually precipitated war between the two powers. In 1846 two American armies moved on the ill-fated Southern neighbor, one from Vera Cruz under General Winfield Scott, another from the Rio Grande under Colonel Zachary Taylor. Tho the Mexican opposition was stubborn it was not highly intelligent, and after a series of brilliant engagements Mexico City was captured and the unhappy nation forced to sue for peace. The terms of the conquerors were harsh indeed. By the treaty of Guadeloupe Hidalgo the United States acquired possession of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and California—some 800,000 square miles.

While the United States was rounding out its

territorial limits to the south, it was negotiating for the great Northwest—the Oregon country. For half a century possession of this rich region had been disputed by England and the United States. Early in the 1840's American emigrants by the hundreds began to find their toilsome way to the fabulous land along the great Oregon Trail, and by 1846 there were several thousand Americans in the region south of the Columbia River. The presence of this population, combined with the pressing emergency in English politics at the time, made the conditions of negotiation for the territory favorable to the United States. The Oregon Treaty of 1846, extending the boundary between this country and Canada along the forty-ninth parallel, must be looked upon as a distinct victory for American diplomacy.

Hard on the heels of the acquisition of California from Mexico came the discovery of gold in the Sacramento Valley, making California a veritable El Dorado for the world. From all parts of America and Europe thousands of wild-eyed fortune hunters and adventurers flocked to the gold fields, creating inside of a year a populous and prosperous, if somewhat turbulent, commonwealth.

Indeed, the whole of the Far West was being filled up, thousands of emigrants crowding the Oregon and California trails to the promised lands on the Pacific. At the same time the

Mormon State of Deseret—later Utah—attracted to its fertile acres other thousands who laid here in what was supposed to be a desert wilderness the foundations for a prosperous and progressive commonwealth.

These new areas could not be acquired and inhabited without raising a host of questions, all centering about the problem of slavery in the Territories. Should the new States be admitted with or without slavery? On that question the sections, North and South, divided. So serious was the division, that by 1850 an open rupture appeared inevitable. That such a break, which would in all probability have been disastrous to the Union, was avoided was due largely to the genius of the aged Henry Clay, who, with the aid of Daniel Webster, pushed through the Compromise of 1850.

That compromise, tho it averted secession and war at the time, was but a stop-gap. The decade from 1850 to 1860 was bathed in the sunlight of prosperity, but the black clouds of slavery loomed ominously in the offing. There were other issues, too, dividing the North and the South: the tariff, the banking system, the question of free lands, the railroads. In reality two fundamentally different civilizations, two hostile social and economic systems, were crystallizing. Viewed from the perspective of three-quarters of a century, it appears that a conflict between them was inevitable.

The incidents that led up to that conflict can be disposed of briefly. The repeal of the well-nigh sacred Missouri Compromise threw open the West to settlement, and led to the break-up of the Whig party and to armed warfare in Kansas Territory. The decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case seemed to deprive the advocates of freedom in the Territories of their constitutional argument. These conditions, the growing sectional alinement, and the general disfavor into which the Whig party had fallen, led to the formation of a new party—the Republican—pledged to oppose the extension of slavery into the Territories and to promote the industrial and agricultural interests of the East and the West.

The new party rolled up over a million votes for its candidate, John Frémont, in 1856. Four years later it nominated a comparatively unknown Illinois lawyer who had distinguished himself in a series of debates with Stephen A. Douglas—Abraham Lincoln. When the Democratic party broke up into several parts, the election of Lincoln was inevitable.

Abraham Lincoln, into whose hands the destiny of the American nation was now entrusted in the most awful crisis of its history, was a man of the people. His democracy was a rugged frontier democracy, not unlike that of Andrew Jackson. He was not a political philosopher or a doctrinaire, but an astute politician, a states-

man guided by experience and a solemn sense of duty, and inspired by a fundamental honesty, an integrity of character, a sincerity and understanding beyond that of other men. The conflict, whose leadership he was forced to accept with hesitation and sorrow, was not of his making. It was a struggle not against the institution of slavery, but in defense of the Union. The Union was preserved, but at enormous cost, and in the fiery cauldron of war the old America, the America that Lincoln represented, disappeared.

The election of Lincoln was the signal for the secession of the South. South Carolina led off in December, 1860, and Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas followed her lead. In February, 1861, representatives of the seceding States met in convention at Montgomery, Alabama, formed the Confederate States of America, drew up a Constitution modeled closely after the Federal one, and chose Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, President.

The South was desirous of seceding peaceably, and a powerful sentiment in the North favored "letting the erring sisters go in peace." Yet, with both sides trying to avert hostilities, the force of events plunged them into war. On April 12, 1861, the batteries of Charleston opened fire on Fort Sumter, out in the harbor, and the war was on. Lincoln called for volunteers; Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and

Arkansas seceded, and the destiny of America was laid in the lap of the God of War.

The war itself we must pass over hurriedly. The task of the Confederacy was essentially a defensive one: to preserve its territory intact, to secure recognition abroad, and to weary the North into acquiescence. The military task of Lincoln was infinitely harder. He had to reduce the South to submission—to subdue a proud, numerous, and compact people, fighting on interior lines in defense of their homes and their institutions.

Through four weary years the Blue and the Gray dashed themselves against each other while the casualties ran into hundreds of thousands and great areas were reduced to a wilderness. The campaign in the East focused on the Confederate capital, Richmond, and here Robert E. Lee, the greatest soldier America has produced, led the army of the South with dauntless courage and incomparable skill, hurling back army after army, defeating one Union general after another. In the West the Union army was more successful. While Admirals Porter and Farragut secured the Mississippi and split the Confederacy in twain, Generals Thomas and Grant drove the Confederates back in Tennessee and Alabama, and Sherman drove a wedge through Georgia and the Carolinas. Pierced on all sides, its transportation system ruined, its commissary broken down, its States quarreling with each other, its

cotton spoiling in the warehouses and its people starving, the South became demoralized and gave up the struggle. On the ninth of April, 1865, at historic Appomattox, Generals Grant and Lee signed terms of capitulation. Five days later Abraham Lincoln was assassinated.

The murder of Lincoln was an irreparable blow to both sides, for at a critical moment it removed from the helm the pilot who alone might have guided the ship of state through the stormy waters of reconstruction, and gave it over to a band of pirates. Well has the Reconstruction period been called the "Tragic Era." During these years, 1865-1876, a powerful, organized group of radical Republicans controlled the politics of the country, flouted the Constitution, inflicted upon the defeated South a Punic peace, and gave over the resources of the nation to dustrialists, financiers, special interests, and politicians.

Over the details of the Reconstruction drama we may well draw the curtain of silence. Military rule was imposed on the South, the negroes were given civil and political rights, the State governments handed over to "carpet-baggers," and it was not until 1877 that home rule was restored throughout the South. In the meantime the radicals had taken the control of the government out of the hands of President Johnson, had attempted to impeach him on trumped-up charges, had flouted the Constitution and the

Supreme Court, and intrenched their party in power.

Of more importance was the social and economic revolution that was accomplished during these years. The emancipation of four million negro slaves, the destruction of the plantation system, the overthrow of the planter class, and the rise of the small farmers and poor whites to power, meant a revolution in Southern society —a revolution from which the "New South" emerged. A corresponding revolution was being effected in the North. The Homestead Act of 1862, granting 160 acres of public land to any settler, threw open vast new stretches of farm lands in the West. The Tariff Act of 1862, the National Banking Act of 1863, the railroad land grants and the Fourteenth Amendment gave to big business and capital a position of dominance from which they have never been dislodged.

It was a period in which the economic foundations of modern America were being laid. Industry, arm-in-arm with science, advanced with giant steps. The use of the McCormick Harvester, the Oliver chilled plow, and a host of other inventions worked a revolution in agriculture. The West was populated, its mineral resources exploited, its Indians subjugated, its millions of acres of grass used for grazing and the development of the Cattle Kingdom. In the seventies and eighties the transcontinental railroads penetrated the last reaches of the West, tying the

nation together with thongs of iron and opening up additional millions of acres for settlement.

It was a period of corruption in national, State and local politics, and of demoralization in American life. The Crédit Mobilier, the Star Route frauds, and the Whisky Ring scandal shook confidence in the national government, and particularly in President Grant and his cabinet. At the same time the Tweed Ring in New York City and the Gas Ring in Philadelphia looted the public treasuries of millions. Political parties became instruments of spoils, and a get-rich-quick mania permeated the whole country. There was a let-down of standards and morals that was reflected in the literature and society of the nation as well as in its politics.

But the era in which politics were of primary importance was rapidly disappearing. The generation after Reconstruction was to see the rise and development of economic and social forces that swept political institutions and barriers aside and determined the course of national destinies: the rise of capitalism and industry, the corporation movement, economic imperialism, the development of urban life, the rise of labor, immigration, the passing of the farmers' West, the development of new sources of power and energy—water, gas, and electricity. These form the substance, the warp and the woof of American history in its most recent phase.

XXV

MODERN AMERICA

THE history of modern America is the history of a highly organized, rapidly expanding, industrial society, essentially dissimilar from the America of an earlier day. This period, roughly from 1876 to the World War, witnessed the extremest development of wealth and poverty, the enormous growth of cities and urban life and interests at the expense of the country and agrarian interests, the passing of the frontier and of that old West with unlimited quantities of cheap land that had long been the safety-valve of American society, and the consequent rise of labor problems and troubles on a wide scale. It witnessed an enormous increase in immigration, and a significant shift in the source of that immigration from the British Isles and northern Europe to Russia, Austria, Italy, and Greece. The melting-pot has been forced to boil more furiously than ever before, and it remains to be seen whether millions of Southern Europeans can be assimilated to American culture and institutions. The period witnessed the rise of social consciousness, the social-welfare movement, and the growth of the so-called Progressive movement. It witnessed, finally, the development of

economic imperialism, the acquisition of non-contiguous territories, the passing of isolation.

It is bootless to trace here the manifold triumphs of science and the giant strides of industry. Seldom in history has the Scriptural dictum to "multiply and subdue the earth" been more faithfully obeyed. But the conquests of nature and the exploitation of natural resources, the rearing of towering smokestacks and the gathering of enormous conglomerations of people into cities—all these could not be accomplished without raising hosts of social and economic and cultural problems. To what extent should industry and business be controlled by the government, to what extent should traditional American individualism be permitted to hold sway? What were to be the relations of industry and trade to society as a whole, and what were its functions to be in the new order of things: personal gains or community welfare? What was to be the share of labor in the new wealth that was being created and in the direction of the new forces that were let loose? Could political democracy exist without economic equality, and could economic equality be said to exist where the bargaining power of capital and labor was so disproportionate? And finally, what would it profit America if she gained the whole world and lost her soul?

These problems, precipitated by scientific and industrial development everywhere and world-

wide in their pertinence, received practical formulation in the issues of social democracy. It is significant that the generation that witnessed the greatest expression of individualism in the realm of economics was likewise the generation of the furthest development of social democracy and social and humanitarian consciousness.

This new social consciousness found early expression in some of the Supreme Court decisions, the most important of which was *Munn vs. Illinois,* laying down the doctrine of "public interest" in private business. The doctrine of public interest received further expression in a series of State and Federal laws regulating railroads, trusts, and combinations. The most important of these were the Interstate Commerce Act and the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, both of which remained relatively ineffective until a later day.

At the same time labor was improving its condition through organization (the American Federation of Labor) and agitation, sometimes taking the form of strikes. Gradually labor was given a juster proportion of the fruits of its efforts; gradually the number of hours of work were reduced, conditions of labor improved, compensation for injuries secured, and laws regulating the labor of women and children put on the statute books.

The new social consciousness began to discover "How the Other Half Lives" and to awaken to

the conditions in the larger cities of the East that threatened to justify all the dire prophecies of Thomas Jefferson a century earlier. Poverty, housing, sanitation, drunkenness, all clamored for reform, and energetic efforts were made to remedy the glaring evils of modern urban life. Social-welfare work, temperance societies, visiting-nurse associations, all became familiar features of American urban life, and men like Jacob Riis, women like Jane Addams, became national characters.

An element of the population that suffered equally with labor from the new economic conditions, was the farmer. Agriculture was unable to adjust itself to the circumstances of modern scientific and industrial life, and tho the value of farms and of farm products increased absolutely, it declined relatively, and the actual income of the farmer declined precipitately. Everywhere in the South and the West there was distress if not actual want. Tenant-farming increased at an alarming rate. These conditions led to organizations of farmers rivaling those of labor, the most important of which were the Grange and the Farmers' Alliance. In 1890 these organizations entered politics, and in 1896 the discontented agrarian element in America found a champion in William Jennings Bryan—the "Peerless Leader."

That Presidential campaign of 1896 was historic in many respects. The defeat of Bryan by

William McKinley, a rather colorless member of the Ohio dynasty, was an unmistakable announcement that manufacturing and capital were the dominant forces in our national life and that Jefferson's dream of an agrarian democracy was dissipated. It was a victory for the East, for conservatism, for an urban-industrial civilization, and the dictum of the electorate in that election has stood unaffected by the passing years.

It was under McKinley that the United States embarked upon a policy of imperialistic expansion whose end is not yet. The occasion was the Spanish-American War. Spanish misgovernment in Cuba, and the explosion of the ill-fated battleship, the *Maine,* precipitated the American government into a war for which neither it nor the country was prepared. But despite this lack of adequate preparation, or even of any great popular enthusiasm, the war was marked by a series of brilliant successes. The Spanish navy was well-nigh annihilated; Cuba was cleared of the enemy, Porto Rico overrun, and the Philippines wrested from their Spanish masters.

Peace brought up the problem of the disposition of these conquests. The decision of the administration to keep Porto Rico and the Philippines was fraught with significance: it meant that the United States, for the first time in its history, was embarked upon the sea of imperialism. It meant that the United States was

definitely committed to an interest in Far Eastern affairs, and was caught up in the web of world politics. It meant the end of "splendid isolation."

When President McKinley was assassinated by a fanatic in 1901 he was succeeded by Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt continued the policy of imperialism inaugurated by his predecessor, by taking an active part in world politics and, more especially, by "taking" Panama in order to construct a canal there. On the other hand, Roosevelt broke with the conservative policy of his Republican predecessors by inaugurating the Progressive Era in American politics, an era that lasted until 1917. For tho Roosevelt differed radically in politics and in character from Woodrow Wilson, and entertained for the latter a profound dislike, the two men were not essentially dissimilar in their social attitudes. Both of them—and William Howard Taft, whose administration came between those of the other two—were enlightened liberals. Both sought to articulate the political and social and constitutional structure of the government to the new economic conditions; both strove to curb the power of business, to elevate labor to a position of equality with capital, to introduce the theory and practise of government control and regulation of activities affecting public welfare, and to elevate the tone of public life. Roosevelt enforced the Sherman Anti-Trust Act; under Wil-

son the Clayton Anti-Trust Act was passed; Roosevelt enforced arbitration between capital and labor; under Wilson the Adamson Eight-Hour Law was written on the statute books. Roosevelt was particularly identified with the conservation of natural resources, Wilson with farm relief and financial reform.

The first years of the Wilson administration gave promise of the most significant reform period in American history. In rapid succession this astute and high-minded college Professor turned statesman, who controlled his party with an iron grip and read public opinion with consummate skill, pushed through one law after another, inaugurated one policy after another. The Underwood Tariff, the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, the Federal Reserve Act, and the Farmers' Loan Act are the principal reform laws of his administration. The Mobile Speech of 1913 announced a new and more liberal policy toward South America, and the reconsideration of that ancient shibboleth, the Monroe Doctrine. Toward our distracted neighbor to the South Wilson preserved a policy of masterly inactivity, or "watchful waiting," and resisted the demands of chauvinists and imperialists and professional patriots everywhere for a war.

With his reform program only partially consummated, and with the Mexican situation still extremely delicate, foreign affairs of a serious and threatening nature commanded the un-

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

XXVI

THE WORLD WAR

"LET the science and research of the historian find the fact, and let his imagination and art make clear its significance."[1] So concluded Mr. George Macaulay Trevelyan in his inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge in 1927.

In considering the World War even eleven years after its close it is to be remembered that the patient and unceasing labors of scores of historians have not yet disclosed all the important facts about it, and that we are still too near it to pass ultimate judgment and to give to this cataclysm its full significance. This is particularly true in regard to its causes. In our all-too-brief survey we can only look upon the broad tendencies which seemed to lead towards the inevitable outbreak in 1914.

We have already hinted that the Industrial Revolution, bringing into being improved means of transportation on land and sea, and at the same time making possible a tremendous increase in the production of goods, had caused the nations of Europe to look beyond their own boundaries for markets for their manufactured

[1] *The Present Position of History* (Longmans, Green & Co.). London, 1927, p. 29.

products. And while industry and trade were in the hands of private individuals, these capitalists found their governments ready and willing to support them in their efforts to find new markets. It was a policy of self-interest for all concerned. The industrialists received aid and the guaranty of security from the government, and made more money; the government collected more taxes. It was only natural, since almost any inhabited area was both a profitable market and a fruitful source of raw materials, that each nation sought to help its trading group by annexing and bringing under its political control such territories as were actual or potential markets and had not already been annexed in the eighteenth-century colonial struggle. The competition for markets, then, became a fierce national struggle for colonial possessions; we commonly label the struggle which took place between 1871 and 1914, imperialism. Thus in the last three decades of the nineteenth century the islands of the Pacific, great areas in Asia, and most of Africa had been appropriated in the fierce competition of rival powers. In 1900 not much remained. The next decade and a half witnessed a struggle over the Ottoman Empire, Persia and China, and Morocco.

The competition, growing more fierce as annexable colony-markets became fewer and as localized counter-claims developed, was intensified by still another force: the definite yet al-

most indefinable phenomenon called nationalism. There are, broadly, two stages of nationalism, one following the other progressively: the first, a determination on the part of peoples of the same language, race, ideals, customs, traditions —in short, of the same interests—to be incorporated into the same political state; second, the determination of such peoples incorporated into the same political state to give to that state the greatest possible glory, prestige, and power. When the Italian peoples were subjects of various principalities their great determination was to be welded into one united kingdom. Once this was accomplished their determination was sublimated, so to speak, into a burning desire to add greater and still greater glory to the Kingdom of Italy, their country, their native land. England, Germany, France, Italy, in fact, virtually all of western Europe, had by 1870 reached this second stage. The nationalism of their peoples in its second stage, i.e., the desire to further the glory of England or Germany or France, served to intensify the competition for colony-markets. This competition, which we call imperialism and which was national in organization, was definitely one of the large forces operating to bring about in 1914 the irrepressible conflict at arms.

As regards the bringing about of war, however, the sentiment of nationalism, from 1871 to 1914, was more than a contributing impetus

to the force of imperialism. We have noted in a preceding chapter that most of the countries in western Europe by the last quarter of the nineteenth century were indeed the achievements of groups who had aspired towards national self-determination. But in eastern and southeastern Europe there were those peoples who had not achieved the goal of nationalism in its first stage; those of like interests who had not been able to unite themselves into politically sovereign states. Their efforts to do so, particularly as those efforts affected the great powers of Europe, constitute in themselves another cause of the World War. Furthermore, these nationalistic struggles by sympathetic contagion intensified the sentiment of nationalism all over Europe. In fact, it is difficult to overemphasize the tenseness of this feeling in the era we are considering.

So strongly, indeed, did the forces we have just described—nationalism and imperialism—influence the actions of the governments of Europe from 1871 to 1914 that the era has been called one of nationalist-imperialist foreign policy, and, in the specific events which took place in the period, nationalism and imperialism do enter as motives again and again.

Before turning to the specific happenings of the period, however, we must take account of another definite cause of the World War—militarism. Militarism is of course an instrument rather than a motive of a nation's foreign pol-

icy. But certainly the adoption of universal military service, the increasing of armaments, the intensified development of military tactics and science constitute a policy—militarism—which, tho an instrument for carrying out a nationalist-imperialist program, was itself in this crucial era a force leading to war. It was the continuance of militarism by the various powers which made Europe at the turn of the century an armed camp. Such action was a flagrant admission that the ultimate means for settling their differences—arising out of the nationalist-imperialist policy—was, and would be, war. Let us note in the actual events which took place between 1871 and 1914 how the forces of nationalism and imperialism with the threat of armies and navies always in the offing, operated, despite the efforts of skilful diplomacy, to make inevitable the catastrophe of 1914.

The chief actors in the international drama were Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy, Germany, and Austria-Hungary. We shall note but briefly the actions of the play which followed one another breathlessly.

After the Franco-German War (1870-1871), Bismarck desired for the preservation of peace to isolate France, who naturally vowed to get back Alsace-Lorraine. His first effort resulted in the league of Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Germany. The two latter could not long remain allies with the Turkish question between them.

Russia felt she did not get her just dues from a victory over Turkey, and withdrew in 1878, ending the so-called League of Three Emperors. Bismarck formed a defensive alliance with Austria-Hungary. In 1881 Italy and France had an imperialistic quarrel over Tunis in Africa. France seized Tunis, and Italy in indignation joined the German alliance with Austria.

Against the Triple Alliance of Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Italy, it was natural that France and Russia, now two unattached powers, should associate themselves. And these two, despite obvious dissimilarities, formed in 1891 a Dual Alliance. Between these two leagues the balance of power in Europe swung. Great Britain to this time had not been seriously interested in European affairs.

But the Straits of Dover were too narrow to allow for long a policy of splendid isolation. The two alliances, including the five powers, would quite evidently concern themselves with more than purely continental matters. Each of them had an imperialist policy, the pursuance of which would naturally be aided by the power's allies and opposed by her enemies. When imperialism became the concern of the two European leagues, England, whose possessions included a quarter of the habitable area of the earth, could not remain unattached. Under William II, who ascended to the German throne in 1888 and dismissed Bismarck in 1890, industrialist Ger-

many became definitely imperialistic. Germany had towards the end of the Bismarckian régime acquired territory, mostly in Africa. William resolved to advance the policy chiefly by constructing a large navy, a step which obviously made his country a rival of England's. Great Britain, largely because of this step, cast her lot with the Dual Alliance. This resulted in what was known as the Triple Entente when, in 1904, France and Great Britain reached an agreement the substance of which was to give the former a free hand in Morocco and the latter control of Egypt, and when, in 1907, Russia and Great Britain by agreement assumed control respectively of northern and southern Persia. Imperialism was looming larger and larger as a motive in the ultimate alinement of great powers. From 1907 it was the Triple Alliance of Germany, Italy, and Austria-Hungary against the Triple Entente of Great Britain, France, and Russia. By this arrangement German imperialism was definitely checked in the important areas of Africa. Germany turned towards the Ottoman Empire; the Berlin-to-Bagdad railway was the pet idea.

In fact, the decay of the Ottoman Empire was one of the serious problems in Europe. The last of the sultan's possessions in Africa, Tripoli, was seized by Italy in 1911. During the nineteenth century, on the basis of national determination, Greece, Montenegro, Rumania, and

Bulgaria had become independent. But the Congress of Berlin (1878), attempting to settle satisfactorily for all concerned the Russo-Turkish war, violated twice the principle of nationality; Bosnia, together with Herzegovina, was placed in the control of Austria, and Macedonia, the very center of the Balkan peninsula, was turned back to the sultan. Bosnia was a Serb-inhabited land and Serbia was sure to make nationalist claims against Austria. The Balkans would not long see Macedonia under Turkish rule. Turkey continued to hold besides Macedonia the territory around Constantinople. When the "sick man" of Europe died, who was going to get the spoils? The independent Balkan states wanted to enlarge their territories; Austria wanted to confirm her hold on Bosnia. And the dream of the Tsars for generations had been Constantinople.

Germany did more than dream. She projected a Berlin-to-Bagdad railway. When this project became known the powers of the Triple Entente were alarmed. The railway would not only assure Germany's control of the Ottoman Empire when the "sick man" died, but would also give her a magnificent land route from Europe to the Orient, which, as a glance at the map will show, would render obsolete England's sea route by the Suez Canal. The pursuance of the German project after 1903 almost caused a war.

How to stop the Berlin-Bagdad railway? The

question faced the Triple Entente. The railway ran through Serbia, through her capital, Belgrade. Serbia was unfriendly towards Austria-Hungary, Germany's ally, because of the Dual Monarchy's control of Bosnia, a land which for reasons of nationality should belong to Serbia. Were Serbia to be encouraged against Austria-Hungary, the Bagdad-Berlin railway project might be checked. Serbia became a focal point in the diplomatic considerations of both the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente.

Austria in 1908 assumed complete sovereignty over Bosnia, which she had hitherto only occupied. The ghosts of the Congress of Berlin were stalking in the Balkans. Serbia immediately protested; the inhabitants of Bosnia were Serb nationalists. The Triple Entente backed Serbia. Germany supported Austria. War loomed, but the hour had not yet come. The Entente gradually withdrew its support from Serbia; the Triple Alliance had won a diplomatic victory. Settlement was only an interlude; European diplomatists were fighting a losing battle.

Tension followed tension in the Balkans. There was the Young Turk revolution in 1908, the Albanian uprising in 1909, the former a democratic and the latter a nationalist demonstration. Macedonia, left to Turkey in 1878, suffered untold misery; the Balkan states bordering on Macedonia decided in 1912 to act, and a short war in 1912 and 1913 defeated the sultan. The

spoils included not only Macedonia but Thrace, leaving European Turkey nothing but Constantinople and a small surrounding area. But the allies, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro, quarreled over the division of spoils. Greece, Serbia, and Montenegro joined against Bulgaria to settle the dispute. The allies, aided by Rumania, won. The Turk was virtually out of Europe, but the Balkan situation was not settled.

The burning sore spot was still the bitterness between Austria and Serbia over Bosnia. The province belonged by nationalist rights to Serbia; Austria held it in possession. Serb societies poured into Bosnia propaganda against Austria and the Habsburg monarchy. On June 28, 1914, the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, and his wife were riding through the Bosnian capital of Serajevo. A group of Bosnian youths murdered them.

Austria acted resolutely and at once. On July 23, 1914, an ultimatum was sent to Serbia, the purpose of which was supposedly to quell finally all Serbian nationalist agitation; but from the nature of the demands in that document and from the fact that Serbia was given only two days in which to reply, there arises the question of whether Austria ever expected Serbia to meet them. Serbia didn't, and on July 28 Austria declared war on her. It must be said to the credit of both the Russian and English foreign offices

that they tried to preserve the peace; the former demanded modification of the Austrian terms and the latter, through Sir Edward Grey, pleaded for mediation.

Germany, as early as July 5, is believed to have given Austria a blanket promise of support. The underlying reason for her support of Austria undoubtedly was that Serbia menaced her imperialist designs in the Balkans, particularly her Berlin-Bagdad railway project. Russia, because she was the leading Slav power and because of her imperialist ambitions in the Balkans, came to the aid of Serbia. Between July 25 and July 30 Russia mobilized. German action was now almost inevitable.

To understand Germany's action it must be said that since 1871 she had become increasingly militaristic-minded. Perhaps the seed had been planted by Frederick the Great, but the full flower did not bloom for a century. German unity and German prosperity were credited to her arms, and her arms were held to be the only protection against hostile encirclement of the Fatherland by European powers.

And when Russia mobilized it was the militarists who brought pressure on the German government to act. Germany gave Russia twelve hours to withdraw the mobilization order, and when Russia ignored the request, the German emperor on August 1 ordered general German mobilization and declared war on Russia. France

was willingly bound by the terms of her alliance and by special understandings to support Russia. Germany asked France to declare her intentions and after receiving a non-committal reply declared war on her. German militarists knew that France and Russia had to be crushed, and there was hope that Paris could be captured before Russia's full force was felt.

But what of Great Britain? Germany probably believed that Britain would remain neutral. Sir Edward Grey is known to have tried repeatedly to secure peaceful settlement, and to have maintained that nothing in the terms of the Triple Entente impaired England's freedom of action, tho there were numerous reasons why she should support France, if not Russia. When Germany decided to violate the neutrality of Belgium in invading France, the issue for Britain seemed clear; she must throw her lot against Germany. Britain declared war August 4.

Italy, contending that the Triple Alliance bound her to support her allies only in case of defensive war and that the declaration of Austria against Italy was offensive, refused to support Germany and Austria. Her action was undoubtedly influenced by a secret Franco-Italian agreement made in 1902 wherein Italy promised not to engage in war against France. Japan was bound by a treaty signed in 1902 to stand with Great Britain in protection of their interests in the Pacific Ocean. This, combined with imperi-

alist ambitions towards the German-controlled Shantung peninsula, brought Japan to the side of the Triple Entente.

The line-up on August 1, 1914, therefore, was Germany and Austria-Hungary, known as the Central Powers, against the Allied or Entente powers: Russia, France, Great Britain, Serbia, Belgium, Japan, and Montenegro. The great forces of nationalism, imperialism, and militarism had dominated too long the policies of European nations. Once again the god of war rode over the earth to threaten for four years the civilization which the peoples had builded.

It is not our purpose to follow in detail the military progress of the war. It was fought on an unprecedented scale, rallying men, resources, machinery, and science to its prosecution. The German offensive in the West, aimed at the capture of Paris, fell short of its goal when French forces stopped it at the battle of the Marne. The struggle in the West became an endurance test of French warfare from 1914 to 1918. But at the end of 1914 Germany had occupied the coal fields of Belgium and North France, and the iron district in French Lorraine. She had stopped the Russian invasion and secured the aid of Turkey.

In 1915 Italy joined the Allies. France and England attempted by the Dardanelles expedition to capture Constantinople, but failed. Bulgaria in 1915 joined the Central Powers after the Germans in a great eastern offensive cap-

tured Warsaw and brought about the collapse of Serbia.

The next year of the war, 1916, was notable for the failure of a German offensive centered on Verdun; they did not pass. Rumania in this year joined the Allies only to have her country quickly overrun by the armies of the Central Powers. Britain and Germany engaged in 1916 in a naval battle at Jutland which confirmed the superiority of the British fleet. The British were effectively throwing a naval blockade around Germany, an action which caused Germany to resort to submarine warfare. As the war went on this became more and more unrestricted against neutral as well as enemy nations.

The year 1917 witnessed the failure of a Franco-British offensive in Champagne and Flanders, the success of an Austro-German offensive in Italy, and the withdrawal, after an internal revolution, of Russia from the ranks of the Allies. But the Allied cause was given hope when the United States of America entered the war, an action made inevitable by Germany's continuance of unrestricted submarine warfare. American public opinion had become highly incensed when the *Lusitania,* with numbers of American nationals aboard, was sunk in 1915. America insisted that the rights of neutrals be maintained. After a patient exchange of notes for nearly two years, America entered.

The final year of the war witnessed Germany's

last attempt, an effort to win on the western front before the United States could throw her full weight into the decisive Allied counter-offensive. The German offensive, lasting from March 21 to July 18, made severe dents in the Allied lines, but the defenders held. The Allied forces, now under the supreme command of Marshal Foch, from July to November drove the armies of the Central Powers out of France, a move greatly aided by American money, supplies, and men. Simultaneously important Allied victories took place on the Balkan and Italian fronts, a combination of circumstances which led to the overthrow of the Hohenzollern and Habsburg monarchies and the agreement of the Central Powers to an armistice on November 11, 1918.

After this all-too-rapid survey of the salient events of the World War we turn to the peace, the supposed compensation for thirty-three millions of casualties and an expenditure of money and resources which mortgaged the western world for generations to come. The large results of the Treaty of Versailles with Germany and similar treaties with other nations we shall consider briefly under three large heads: punitive measures against the Central Powers, settlements on the basis of the principle of nationality, and the League of Nations.

To France Germany was forced to surrender Alsace-Lorraine and the coal mines of the Saar

Basin. The final destiny of the Saar Basin, exclusive of the coal fields, was to be settled in fifteen years by a plebiscite, and was to be administered meanwhile by the League of Nations. Danzig became a free city. To Poland she surrendered Posen and West Prussia. Plebiscites also decided the future of East Prussia and Silesia; the eastern area voted to join Poland and the western area Germany. The northern part of Schleswig voted to become Danish; the southern part remained German. Malmedy voted to join Belgium. All the German colonies were left to mandatory administration subject to the League of Nations.

From the Central Powers also Rumania received Transylvania, the Bukovina, and half the Banat. To these Bessarabia was added from Russia in 1918. Italy gained the Trentino, Trieste, and Istria. Greece gained from Bulgaria the Ægean seaboard, and from Turkey she gained Thrace from Adrianople to Chatalja. (Turkey later received back Eastern Thrace.) In addition the Central Powers, chiefly Germany, were made to restore all damage done in the conflict, to surrender their naval and military equipment, and to reduce their armed forces to absolute minima; also to make payments of tremendous amounts in goods and money. Never had combatants submitted to such humiliating terms.

President Wilson of the United States went to the Peace Conference determined that in the re-

adjustment of Europe the principle of nationality should prevail. Five of his famous Fourteen Points bore directly on that determination. To a degree it did prevail; where there was a question, Allied opinion of course won out. But the effort had these results: an independent Poland; four independent republics—Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia, and Finland—in the Baltic region; the splitting up of the old Dual Monarchy, Austria-Hungary, into Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Hungary, and Jugo-Slavia.

What were the outstanding breaches of nationality—due in some cases to the near-impossibility of determining boundaries on national principles and in other cases to the demands of the victors—manifested in the peace treaties?

Of the territories given Italy, Southern Tyrol is German and most of Istria is Slav. In Czecho-Slovakia millions of Germans reside, as well as Magyars and Little Russians. Poland has not only Poles, but Ukrainians. The inhabitants of the republic of Austria voted for union with Germany, but the victors, fearing a strengthened Germany, forbade it.

But by far the greatest accomplishment of the Peace Conference was the formation of a League of Nations, the instrument on which Woodrow Wilson staked his all. The League of Nations was launched as an organization "to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security." The three fea-

tures of the League are an Assembly, a Council, and a Secretariat. The Assembly consists of representatives of every state which is a member of the League, each state having one vote. The Council was originally to consist of representatives of the five great Allied powers (the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan—but the United States did not ratify the Covenant) and four representatives of four other members of the League chosen by the Assembly. The five were considered permanent and the four rotating or non-permanent. The Council now consists of fourteen members; five—the British Empire, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan—permanent; and nine non-permanent. To the Council are given most of the functions necessary to the carrying out of the main purpose of the League, the preservation of peace.

The Secretariat is a permanent international civil service carrying out the day-by-day functions of the League, an organization of experts and assistants doing the League's routine work.

A supplementary creation of the Covenant of the League is a Permanent Court of International Justice located at the Hague.

XXVII

POSTLUDE

If the record of the World War is set down with presumption by the writer of history because he is too close to it to perceive its meanings, then the present, the last decade, should be considered as almost entirely without his realm. The concern of history in the last analysis is "what really happened long ago in that land of mystery which we call the past." The present, like an exciting experience of but a moment ago, is too much with us to tell "what really happened"; hence, the historian who stays in his rôle leaves the present to the philosopher, the critic, and even to the prophet.

We can, however, in the remaining pages record a few outstanding events and developments of the past ten years which seem, without the advantage of perspective, to be fraught with some significance. We shall limit ourselves closely and consider but a few phenomena: first, two developments which followed—chronologically if not causally—the World War, namely, the League of Nations and other efforts at world peace, and the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia and of Mussolini in Italy; second, a movement almost world-wide on the part of great masses of men and women to better themselves mate-

rially and to gain a broader outlook on life by means of education; and, finally, the domination of science and the machine.

"The League of Nations," declared an English historian, "is the cardinal fact of post-war Europe. . . . It has failed to perform miracles, but it has already done a great deal of useful work." In October, 1929, the League of Nations Association in New York reported that fifty-four states were then members of the League. The League of Nations listed among its more important achievements the handling of nine controversies in which war was threatened or actually begun; the holding of a conference of forty-five nations, including the United States, in 1925, at which an agreement was framed for control of international arms traffic, and for prohibition of chemical and bacteriological warfare; the facilitating of reconstruction—in particular the saving of both Austria and Hungary from economic collapse; the befriending of minorities by the establishment of machinery whereby the complaints of racial, religious, and linguistic minorities in fourteen nations became known to the world. Scarcely less important were the accomplishments of the League in public health and control of illicit traffic. It had carried on an effective warfare against epidemic diseases. It had made progress in stamping out traffic in women and children, and had done much to limit each country in the manufacture

of harmful drugs. Perhaps the greatest achievements of the League were intangible; it had served as an international forum, it had been the great factor in cultivating international-mindedness, and it had brought face to face each year the statesmen of the many nations who, in merely gathering at Geneva, had done much to lay the foundations of mutual trust among the peoples of the world.

Turning to other efforts towards better international understanding, we can only recall the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments in 1921-22, at which progress was made towards thwarting a race in the building of battleships, and towards a better understanding, a clearing up of affairs in Asia; the settlement for a time at least of Inter-Allied debts; the adjustment of German reparations by two commissions headed respectively by Mr. Charles G. Dawes and Mr. Owen D. Young; the prospective inclusion of the United States in the World Court; the Locarno Conference, at which the powers of Europe guaranteed boundaries and as a result of which Germany was admitted to the League of Nations; and, finally, the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact, in which the leading nations of the world renounced war as an instrument of national policy.

These agencies and efforts did not, of course, insure the peace of the world, and yet it is almost safe to say that there was in the world of

1929 an unprecedented sentiment against war.

Aside from the League of Nations and other attempts at world peace, the most significant result of the World War was probably the triumph of the Bolshevist régime in Russia, a dictatorship of the proletariat. When the Romanov dynasty was overthrown in 1917, altho liberal opinion throughout the world applauded, Russia herself was in a wild state of confusion. A moderate democratic group under Kerensky failed to resolve the situation, with the result that the Bolshevists, an extreme socialistic group led by Lenin and Trotsky and later by Stalin, came into power—and, it must be admitted, temporarily saved Russia—with a program of giving citizenship and the control of the government only to all useful workers. Representation was on the basis of industries, which chose delegates to the "soviet" or governing body. Each locality had a district soviet; over these were provincial soviets, and, finally, there was at Petrograd (now Leningrad) a supreme soviet.

The Soviet government succeeded in maintaining its powers by a policy of suppression and terror against all who opposed it. As a result of Bolshevist domination, Russia had remained almost an international outcast; her form of government, which by propaganda she had tried to perpetrate on the rest of the world, was feared and resisted. The Soviet government had since 1923, however, compromised its principles by

the admission of private capital. What state of affairs had existed in that vast nation during the past few years was a matter almost of speculation, so varying were reports on it. It is sufficient to say that Russia constituted the most interesting social, economic, and political experiment of the post-war era.

The state of chaos in Italy following the World War was scarcely less alarming than that in Russia. Socialist groups in many parts of the country took over the industries, and the government could only acquiesce. But conditions grew worse. Bankruptcy set in and anarchy reigned. Rigorous action, it must be admitted, was eminently necessary. It came when in October, 1922, an army of Black Shirts marched on Rome, and their leader, Mussolini, was invited by King Victor Emmanuel II to become prime minister. The black shirt was the ominous emblem of the Fascisti, a patriotic group organized when their country's plight was darkest in the World War, to maintain Italian perseverance in the struggle. Their leader, Mussolini, proclaiming himself a spiritual son of the Cæsars, succeeded in at least bringing order out of chaos and in making his country in the next seven years one of the strongest powers in Europe. True it is that his methods harked back to the ancestry he claimed; the Fascisti remained in power by suppressing and terrorizing opposition. Mussolini was called

the only figure in present-day Europe comparable to the ex-Kaiser. But if the parliamentary dreams of a Cavour were forgotten, it was nevertheless admitted that the Italy of 1929 was finding as never before her place in the sun.

Is there uncanny significance in the undoubted fact that the two most patently manifest political phenomena of the post-war world were, paradoxically, the rise of dictatorships and the unprecedented pursuance of a policy of peace?

If the observer's gaze were turned for a moment, however, from the world of political affairs to the activities of the undistinguished masses in the post-war world, he discovered men and women of all ages and stations making an effort unprecedented in the annals of human aspiration to fit themselves by the obvious means of education for a higher plane in the social and economic scale. That the aim of this effort was merely material self-betterment was a generalization of too sweeping proportions. There somehow arose after the vast carnage ended in 1918 the world-wide conviction that the key to salvation for the individual and the group lay in education. Hundreds of thousands apparently were interested not only in finding out from text-books and lectures, by discussions and laboratory experiments, how day-by-day tasks might be better and more profitably done, but

also in discovering by the same means, if possible, the heritages of the past, the tendencies of the present, and the possibilities of the future.

Wherefore else could the observer explain the story told by mere statements and figures? Since 1920 the number of college students in America alone had doubled, and the total by 1928 had reached three-quarters of a million. During the same period enrolment in high schools also had doubled and included in 1928 more than half the children fifteen to eighteen years of age. What was true of America was true in slightly lesser degree throughout the world. When before had the armies of Europe set up by spontaneous demand schools and colleges for the training of young men in non-military subjects? In China, in Russia, in Czecho-Slovakia, and in Germany, there were definite youth movements with the seeking of education, mental and physical, as one of their paramount aims.

More significant still perhaps were the numbers of mature men and women the world over enrolled in schools of adult education, workers' colleges, correspondence schools, and radio courses, most of whom gave up for study hours usually devoted to pleasure and rest.

What the entire educational movement would lead to, what its immediate significance was, the historian could scarcely foretell. A hint may have been given when an English bishop, speak-

ing before the World Association for Adult Education held at Cambridge, England, in 1929, declared, "I see in the spread of adult education one of the greatest safeguards for international good-will."

If there was another and no less important phenomenon which characterized the world of 1929 it was the domination in all countries of the West—and the penetration into the Orient had more than begun—of science and the machine. If America was an extreme example, she was, none the less, but in the vanguard of a movement which encircled the globe.

Since the turn of the century—even since the close of the war—the Industrial Revolution had accelerated its progress a hundred-fold. Science, while not lessening its efforts in pure research, had turned also to utilitarian application, and made myriad contributions; "standardized parts" and "mass production," the two new instrumentalities of the god of the machine, had made possible the turning of each contribution into millions of units. The most obvious illustrations told the story. There was in America in 1929 a telephone for every six persons. There were in use more than twenty million automobiles, or one for every family. In the same year there were in American homes more than seven million radio sets. The electrical generating plants in the America of 1929 produced, accord-

ing to Mark Sullivan,[1] more than a hundred billion horse-power-hours.

To go on elaborating by example the manifestations and even the efforts of science and the machine in the world of 1929 would be a work of supererogation; the evidences were everywhere.

Let us in bringing to a close an outline of the history of the world remember that the Industrial Revolution, far from being ended in 1929, was still gathering momentum. Its two promising instrumentalities, science and the machine, had in the last century remade—nay, were still remaking—the world in which man lived. In the development of the ideas of nationality and democracy they were forces of tremendous influence. The World War, at least in the largeness of its proportions, was their monstrous offspring. And as the fourth decade of the twentieth century was about to open, there was probably neither man nor child within the compass of western civilization who had not come under the touch of their mighty steel fingers.

For better or for worse? That was the question the historian asked and the philosopher pondered.

It was pointed out, even by casual observers, that notwithstanding widespread protests

[1] Cf. "Thirty Years of Progress" in *World's Work* (Doubleday, Doran) for November, 1929.

against the standardization which it imposed upon the race, the rapid conversion of the findings of pure science into numerous utilities of common use had nevertheless for even the masses of toiling men spectacularly wiped out the limitations of mere space; and it was further pointed out that for men at their work and women in their homes the identical process had literally turned back the hands of time—so abundant was the leisure provided.

It was also recognized by those whose eyes saw beneath and beyond the mere general adoption of the fruits of science in the realm of life's utilities, that the day must surely come when the age-old values of life and the world must undergo the inevitable process of transvaluation. But there prevailed the hope that when the day should come no value that was real would be cast as rubbish to the void—but rather that all would be conserved in that perfect unity of civilization towards which the whole creation seemed to move.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Henry, *History of the United States During the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison,* 9 vols. (Scribner), 1889.

Beard, Charles A. and Mary, *The Rise of American Civilization,* 2 vols. (Macmillan), 1927.

Bowers, Claude, *Jefferson and Hamilton: The Struggle for Democracy in America; Party Battles of the Jackson Period; The Tragic Era* (Houghton Mifflin), 1925.

Braun, Geoffrey, *The Enlightened Despots* (Henry Holt), 1929.

Channing, Edward, *History of the United States,* 6 vols. (Macmillan).

Dark, Sidney, *The Story of the Renaissance* (Doran), 1929.

Faulkner, H. U., *American Economic History* (Harper), 1924.

Goodwin, Cardinal, *History of the Trans-Mississippi West* (Appleton), 1922.

Hattersley, Alan F., *A Short History of Western Civilization* (Macmillan), 1927.

Hayes, C. J. H., *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe,* 2 vols. (Macmillan), 1916, 1924.

McGrady, S. H., *A Note-Book of European History, 1400-1920* (Thomas Y. Crowell), 1928.

Morison, S. E., *The Oxford History of the United States,* 2 vols. (Oxford University Press), 1927.

Parrington, V. L., *Main Currents of American Thought,* 2 vols. (Harcourt, Brace), 1927.

Randall, John Herman, Jr., *The Making of the Modern Mind* (Houghton Mifflin), 1926.

Rhodes, James F., *The United States Since the Compromise of 1850,* 8 vols. (Macmillan).

Schevill, Ferdinand, *A History of Europe* (Harcourt, Brace), 1925.
Trevelyan, George Macaulay, *The Present Position of History* (Longmans), London, 1927.